

1.1

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS
Meeting of the
SUBCOMMITTEE ON FUNCTIONAL CONSOLIDATION
of
LOCAL GOVERNMENTS.

Los Angeles, (California)
February 27-28, 1958,

Members of Subcommittee

Frank Lanterman, Chairman
Carl A. Britschgi
Ernest R. Geddes
Seth J. Johnson
Clark L. Bradley, ex officio

California, Legislative

ASSEMBLY, INTERIM COMMITTEE

on

MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

CALIFORNIA
STATE LIBRARY
FEB 3 - 1959
DOCUMENTS SECTION

Members

Clark L. Bradley, Chairman
Frank G. Bonelli
Carl A. Britschgi
Ernest R. Geddes
Sheridan N. Hegland
James L. Holmes

William Biddick, Jr., Vice Chairman
Seth J. Johnson
Herbert R. Klockslem
Frank Lanterman
Roy J. Nielsen
Gordon H. Winton

Milton R. Farrell, Research Director Cristine B. Harrison, Secretary

20

I N D E X

(In order of appearance)

	<u>Page No.</u>
Albert Albertoni, President, Federated Fire Fighters of California	3, 46, 55
Capt. Fred C. Smith, Los Angeles County Fire Fighters Assn., Chairman, Federated Fire Fighters Committee on Functional Consolidation	5, 46, 147, 148, 155
Kenneth Hahn, Supervisor, 2nd District, Los Angeles Co. .	27
Lee Center, Mayor Redondo Beach	54, 73
Hollis Peavey, Mayor, City of Downey	55
William L. Miller, Chief Engineer, Los Angeles City Fire Department	95
Melvin Horton, Research Director, Property Owners' Tax Association	101
John Colton, District Engineer, Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific	110
Ralph Eliaser, with firm of Daniel W. Johnson and Associates.	133, 148, 152, 154
Lewis Keller, Associate Counsel, League of California Cities.	159

ASSEMBLY INTERIM COMMITTEE
on
MUNICIPAL AND COUNTY GOVERNMENT

Clark L. Bradley, Chairman

Meeting of the Subcommittee on Functional Consolidation of
Local Governments. Los Angeles Police Auditorium, February
27 and 28, 1958. Frank Lanterman, Chairman.

Present:

Frank Lanterman, Chairman	James L. Holmes (Member of Full
Seth J. Johnson	Committee)
Roy J. Nielsen	Clark L. Bradley, ex officio

Staff Present:

Milton R. Farrell, Research Director
Mrs. Cristine B. Harrison, Committee Secretary

TRANSCRIPT OF PROCEEDINGS

CHAIRMAN CLARK L. BRADLEY: Ladies and gentlemen,
this is a meeting of the Interim Committee on Municipal and
County Government, the Subcommittee on Functional Consolidation.
We are meeting here under House Resolution 277 (1957). The
Chairman of the Subcommittee is the Hon. Frank Lanterman of
La Canada whom I will introduce at this time. Mr. Lanterman
will take over and introduce the other members of the Committee
and call the witnesses. Mr. Lanterman.

LANTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Bradley.

In starting our meeting this morning it is appro-
priate that I acquaint the audience with the other members of
the Committee. The Hon. Seth Johnson of the Los Angeles area

is at my left; Milton Farrell, who is the Consultant to the Committee, is the one speaking to our Secretary, Mrs. Harrison; Mr. Bradley; the Hon. Jim Holmes from Santa Barbara; and the Hon. Roy Nielsen from Sacramento.

This Subcommittee is looking into the problems of Functional Consolidation and it is hoped that these hearings will lead to information and background that will be of help between the areas of local government in mutual consideration of their problems for purposes of economy and efficiency, if that is possible, within the structure of this appropriate procedure.

The history of this committee, this subcommittee, has led to substantial consolidations throughout the State on a voluntary permissive basis. We are not interested in any mandatory procedure whatever. We are only interested in finding and exploring ways and means where local government can work together on a basis of mutual understanding and mutual benefit.

Our first witness this morning will be Albert Albertoni, President of the Federated Fire Fighters of California, whose report on a proposed consolidation of fire service, or consolidated fire service, in the Los Angeles area, was published by this committee for exploratory purposes to pose a problem and to propose a solution to that problem. We are exploring today those aspects which will be considered favorable and those considered unfavorable as to the proposals contained within that report.

In addition to the testimony relating to the report, we will hear conditions and problems developed by the county contract system for services to cities in the County of Los Angeles. This is a broad study, and we are starting it this morning with the fire consolidation because the Fire Fighters' report was submitted at our last meeting and was scheduled to be heard at the next meeting of our committee.

Mr. Albertoni will now make his presentation.

ALBERT ALBERTONI, President Federated Fire Fighters of California: Mr. Lanterman and members of the Committee, we are presenting herewith our study relative to the need for and the feasibility of functional consolidation of the fire protection services within Los Angeles County. This study was conducted by the Federated Fire Fighters of California and was restricted to a consideration of fire protection in Los Angeles County only because that seemed to be the area most in need of a serious reevaluation of the present structure. This is the result of the tremendous growth which has taken place in the Los Angeles metropolitan area in the past thirty years. It may well be that there are other metropolitan areas located within the State of California where such a reevaluation would be advisable, and where consideration of the question of functional consolidation may be warranted. We are advised that areas such as Santa Clara County, Sacramento and Alameda County are seriously considering this problem.

In presenting this study, the Federated Fire Fighters of California would like to state that an enormous amount of data has been collected which we believe is important to the question of the feasibility of functional consolidation of the fire protection services within Los Angeles County. Even though this study represents a relatively large presentation, further details are available, particularly with regard to Chapter 2 and Chapter 4. We will be glad to furnish this detailed information upon request of your subcommittee.

Secondly, we desire to express our appreciation to the various city officials and fire department officials throughout the County who have been most cooperative in furnishing data to assist us in making this study. We also wish to express the same sincere appreciation to the Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific and the Pacific Rating Bureau for their excellent cooperation. To those members of the Federated Fire Fighters of California who have given so generously of their time to make this study possible, we express our deepest gratitude. This includes the committee of 25 members responsible for the survey resulting in Section B of Chapter 2 which represents the data relative to the cost of fire protection within Los Angeles County.

In conducting this exhaustive study, we have endeavored to present all pertinent data available in an impartial manner. In presenting our findings, we would like to assure your subcommittee that it is not our desire to

depreciate any existing fire department or organization within this county or its facilities.

I would like to express briefly that the Federated Fire Fighters of California, gentlemen, is simply a State Association of the International Association of Fire Fighters representing the professional fire service throughout the United States and Canada. In addition to the committee studying metropolitan fire problems of our State Association, the International Association also has a committee working on this problem as it pertains generally to cities in the United States and Canada.

It is our sincere hope that this study will prove of value to your subcommittee in its consideration of the question of functional consolidation of the fire protection services within Los Angeles County.

Gentlemen of the Committee, this particular study is relative to Los Angeles County and was carried on principally by our local organization, the Los Angeles County Fire Fighters Association. To further go on with this problem, I think it more appropriate that I introduce the Chairman of that committee and have him carry on the discussion for the Federated Fire Fighters, so at this time, with your permission, I would like to introduce Captain Fred Smith, the Chairman of our committee.

LANTERMAN: Captain Smith.

CAPTAIN FRED C. SMITH, Los Angeles County Fire Fighters Association, and Chairman of the Federated Fire

Fighters of California Committee on Functional Consolidation:
Mr. Chairman, and members of the Committee, my name is Fred Smith, and I am Chairman of the Committee that compiled the information and prepared this report. This presentation is made on behalf of the Federated Fire Fighters of California. The purpose is to present to this committee, other witnesses and the public, a brief resume of our report on the Fire Services of Los Angeles County. The report was completed in the latter part of 1956 and submitted to this committee on December 14, 1956. Since that time, the report has become, we believe, one of the most widely distributed and popular documents of its kind.

The procurement of information, the compilation of facts and figures, the preparation of the various charts, maps, etc., and the final writing of the report was based on the adoption of a definite policy. This policy in effect stated that at no time would any member deviate from a "middle of the road" approach, that at all times they would refrain from allowing any outside pressures or their own personal feelings influence their thinking. The members of the committee who conducted the actual survey were thoroughly aware of the provisions of the adopted policy and it was strictly adhered to. Therefore, we believe the final draft of the report to be as factual, unbiased, fair and equitable as possible, and further we believe that the information contained therein will be helpful in solving the problems of consolidation.

To our knowledge, the fire fighters are the only employee group who are cooperating with the various legislative bodies with full active participation in the program. We have a definite interest and an actual stake in our government, and it is imperative that we participate in order that we may protect our people, and do a better job in behalf of the taxpayer.

Los Angeles County, Its Growth and Nature of its Fire Protection

Before the current problems of fire protection in the Los Angeles metropolitan area are enumerated, a brief review of the origin and development of these problems may be helpful. Basically, of course, the need for re-evaluation of fire protection in Los Angeles County is due to the rapid transition of the many "isolated" cities into a huge metropolitan area, and the "new look" of these cities due to this rapid expansion. Los Angeles County contains almost the entire metropolitan area within its jurisdictional boundaries; therefore, the first section of this report is devoted to the historical growth of the area.

The Growth of Los Angeles County

The county has had a phenomenal population growth. In 1850 the region contained 3,530 persons. By 1910 the population had increased to 504,131, and 47 years later in 1957, it had increased to a total of 5,561,986.

Los Angeles County is now the third largest metropolitan area in the United States. Here will be found 61

municipalities of varying sizes and population, 14 thickly populated unincorporated areas that have over 100,000 population, and over 30 unincorporated "islands" of considerable area and population, entirely surrounded by incorporated territory.

At present, the county's population is growing at the rate of over 16,000 persons per month and there seems to be little doubt that the trend of population increase will continue for many years. Studies of immigration to the area, as well as birth over death rate factors, indicate that the county should grow to approximately 7,000,000 population by 1963.

Cities in Los Angeles County

The great changes that have taken place in the little communities that incorporated in Los Angeles County long ago are well known. Until recent years, the county was composed of many communities set apart by large rural areas. This situation has changed quite radically. At present there are few or no rural areas separating these communities, so that it is now difficult to tell where one community ends and the other begins. Los Angeles City has grown to the third largest city in population, and the largest in terms of area in the United States. Four cities now have between 50,000 and 100,000 residents.

Annexations

The important factor affecting present day fire protection is the expansion pattern of the cities. Continual

annexations by the cities suffering from growing pains through the years, have left many cities with extremely awkward boundary lines. (Slide is thrown on screen) Slide No. 1 is an outline of the boundaries of the City of Glendora as it exists today. The effect of strip annexations and the resulting difficulty in providing fire protection is graphically illustrated here. It is interesting to note that a county fire department station is located where Mr. Desautels has the pointer. The City station is located in the west center of the picture.

Quite often cities have struggled between themselves as to which city would gain lucrative sections of the unincorporated territory. These contests often resulted in so-called strip annexations, thus the extremely odd shapes of many cities in the County.

Slide No. 2 is the City of El Monte shown on the slide, another graphic illustration of irregular boundary lines that create such a problem in determining jurisdiction as to who fights what fires.

As of 1957, cities with numerous annexations were Los Angeles (140), El Monte (116), Whittier (116), Long Beach (100), Compton (109), Covina (84), Glendora (68), Pasadena (53), West Covina (50), Glendale (39), and Monrovia (24). There were 127 separate annexations to 23 of the 61 incorporated cities during the 1957 calendar year. By January 1, 1958, the total area within the cities amounted to 882.6 square miles, an increase of about 148 square miles since April of 1950. This

was accomplished by 701 annexations in addition to the incorporation of 16 cities.

Normal annexation is the only way for a healthy city to expand. However, far too often annexations in Los Angeles County have been carried out with very little thought toward planning, or giving adequate service to the newly annexed areas. (Slide) This is a picture of the City of Covina which has grown from the original one square mile of city, as indicated by Mr. Desautels.

The County has now developed to a point where there are very few uninhabited areas. On the other hand, people in many well populated unincorporated communities are quite often satisfied with the type of service rendered by the county, and do not desire to annex to any city. This has stopped expansion in many areas, and caused some of the "overly-anxious-to-grow" cities to spread out in all directions, with little hope of correcting the situation.

Incorporations

The rapid growth, together with a combination of other factors, including the new city sales tax revenue advantage, has recently started a trend toward incorporations. At present there are several communities in the county starting incorporation proceedings. The cities of Bellflower, Industry, Norwalk, Paramount, Pico-Rivera, Santa Fe Springs, and Rolling Hills have recently incorporated. On the slide shown at the present time, the areas shaded in in blue are the recently incorporated cities since 1954.

There is good reason to believe that this trend toward incorporation could very well confuse the picture even more. Incorporation may hinder rather than help the overall metropolitan problem. Each added unit of government makes the task of coordinating and consolidating that much more difficult. Incorporation in the long run then may cause more headaches than it relieves. Thus far it has had little effect on fire protection, since fifteen of the sixteen newly incorporated cities have continued to subscribe to the facilities of the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Protection District. However, if a trend should start in future incorporations toward establishment of more city fire departments, the metropolitan fire protection picture would become increasingly clouded.

Fire Departments in Los Angeles County

There is a total of 47 fire departments operating in the metropolitan area of Los Angeles County. Two of these departments are about as large as the other 45 put together. In all the cities and in the county fire department there are over 6,000 uniformed fire fighters.

Los Angeles City. The Los Angeles City Fire Department is one of the largest in the United States. It employs approximately 2,700 men. There are 93 fire stations scattered throughout the 453 square miles that comprise the City of Los Angeles. The department is rated by the National Board of Fire Underwriters as Class 1. This is the highest

rating that can be accorded a fire department. Only three other departments in the United States - Detroit, Milwaukee, and Washington, D.C., enjoy this rating. Many of the smaller departments throughout this area are patterned after the central city due to this excellent national recognition.

Los Angeles County Fire Department. The Los Angeles County Fire Department is composed of six fire protection districts, and the activities of the County Forester and Fire Warden Department. It is the second largest fire department in Los Angeles County, with approximately 1500 fire fighters and 98 stations serving 1,398,000 people. The major district within the department is the Consolidated Fire Protection District, which protects the major portion of the unincorporated county area and serves 1,069,000 people. The entire department has grown tremendously from its meager beginning in 1923 to the third largest department west of Chicago.

The Los Angeles County Fire Department has two major functions:

1. The protection of watershed area which is financed by a separate general tax, and
2. The protection of the remaining unincorporated areas by six fire protection districts, which are financed by special district taxes.

The County Fire Department protects an area of some 2,200 square miles, including some of the largest manufacturing districts in Southern California. Over \$500,000,000 worth of

industrial buildings were erected in one year, 1954, in one section of the county. It is a difficult administrative task to operate this department since it covers an area which is considerably greater in area than the states of Delaware and Rhode Island and embraces every conceivable type of industrial, mercantile and residential area. In this area there are 61 cities, 47 of which have their own fire departments.

Fifteen cities that are included within the Consolidated Fire Protection District have recently incorporated. One of these, the city of Lakewood, has a population of over 70,000 people. In addition to the protection of these many populated areas, with their many thousands of homes and businesses, the County Fire Department is still responsible for the protection of the forested and brush covered areas of Los Angeles County. This in itself is a major task and quite important since fire damage to the watershed is one of the greatest natural hazards in Southern California.

The Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific has given many of the unincorporated areas a very high rating. Lakewood, West Hollywood, and Altadena all have a Class 2 fire department grade. Only one other city in Los Angeles County has been given this high rating other than the Los Angeles City Fire Department, and that is Pasadena.

Other Fire Departments. There are 45 municipal fire departments other than the Los Angeles City and the Los Angeles County Fire Departments. Each of these operate from one to

seventeen stations, and they vary in manpower from a part time chief in Sierra Madre to almost 350 fire fighters in Long Beach. Seventeen cities have but one station. Ten others have two, and eight more have but three. Many of the smaller cities are in the process of expanding their fire departments to keep pace with the growth factor, and of course, this picture will soon change.

Long Beach is the third largest fire department in the county and the next largest are Pasadena and Glendale, with between 100 and 150 men each. Other large departments are found in Santa Monica, Alhambra, Burbank, Culver City, Pomona, South Gate, Torrance, Beverly Hills, and Vernon; they each have between 50 and 100 men. All the others have fewer than fifty employees.

For the most part, the small cities in the area are doing a good job on first alarm fires and many of them have an excellent fire department. This point is brought out later in the report. However, functional consolidation would greatly improve the plight of the smaller cities in control of second and third alarm fires, or when more than one fire occurs at the same time. Manpower and equipment are not available in a small city for these emergencies and successful coordination is often difficult when mutual aid is requested to supplement their own forces.

Fire Protection in Los Angeles County Today

The small departments in Los Angeles County are dependent upon the larger city departments, or the Los Angeles County Fire Department for fire protection, because they do not have enough equipment to handle a large fire. This aid is given freely when available and the records show that the two largest departments responded to approximately 460 alarms outside their jurisdictional limits during the year of 1956.

Each year large fires such as brush and forest fires occur that cannot be handled by one department. These fires affect every resident in the county due to the loss of watershed. Heavy rains run off burned hillsides without soaking in. This results in loss of water supply, and the run-off causes destructive and sometimes disastrous floods. There has always been excellent cooperation between departments in fighting these fires, but coordination is extremely difficult to achieve due to differences within the departments in communications, training, and equipment. If the people of the area were to have a major disaster, or be subjected to an Atomic bombing, these differences between departments could severely hamper our fire defenses.

Mutual Aid brings up the problem of smaller cities that depend on their larger neighbors for aid and thus inadequately strengthen their own service. Smaller cities do not have enough equipment to reciprocate aid and if they do send it, they critically weaken their own fire defenses. Mutual Aid also involves critical delay due to channeling requests through the proper officials. This necessitates numerous telephone communi-

cations and re-assignment of apparatus and manpower to areas outside their own jurisdiction. These delays cause a definite possibility of increased loss of life and property to the taxpayer in the smaller city.

THE PRACTICAL APPROACH TO THE ACTUAL COST OF FIRE
PROTECTION IN THE COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

Since cost to the taxpayer is of primary consideration, and in order to give a true and complete picture of all costs connected with the maintenance and administration of a fire department, we have endeavored to bring all the facts to your attention. It is our belief that the consolidation of all the fire departments in Los Angeles County into one Metropolitan Fire Department would be in the best interests of the public, for it would give them the best possible protection at the lowest practical cost.

In order to do this, it was necessary to peruse and compile information from the budgets of 40 municipalities. The budgets allocated to the fire departments were analyzed to determine what costs directly relating to fire department activities were not included in these fire department budgets, but were of necessity included in the General Fund Budget of the municipality. These funds must come from somewhere. They are costs that have to be paid with money - money that has to come from someone, and that someone is the taxpayer.

In the past few years there has been much data published on the cost of operating fire departments of the various

municipalities in the County of Los Angeles. For the most part, they have been true as far as they have gone, but the complete picture of costs seems never to be in evidence. There have been publications on "per capita" cost and publications on the tax rate in ratio to the assessed valuation; but due to the fact that there are so many variables to figure, these publications have failed to show the complete picture. Cities with a large industrial area and a small population will naturally show a small tax rate for the assessed valuation, but conversely, the per capita rating is extremely high. An example of this is evident in Table XI, page 46, of the consolidation report.

The City of Signal Hill has an assessed valuation tax rate of 32 cents per \$100 and a per capita rate of \$27.25. The city of El Segundo is another example of this correlation as can be seen from Table XII, page 47, of the consolidation report.

Figures which indicate a more normal tax base are evident in the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Protection District rate. This is due to a more even distribution of assessed valuation in ratio to population. Using the figures for the year 1956, the table shows a more equitable figure and it is factually correct. The assessed valuation tax rate was 57 cents per \$100 and the per capita cost was only \$6.47.

It is evident that the above comparisons do not necessarily show the true picture since many hidden costs were not included in the existing fire department budgets. To bring

the true picture to light, it was necessary to compile a list of cost items which very seldom appear in fire department budgets of many municipalities. These items are listed in Table IV, page 29, of the consolidation report.

Some of the major items are:

Civil Service Charges. Reference is made to Table III, page 25. The procurement of personnel is a direct cost to fire department operation, yet 39 cities excluded this cost from their fire department budget. Modern concepts in public administration clearly indicate that as a department function grows, the cost of processing each employee decreases.

Fire and Liability Insurance. Municipalities usually carry this insurance in an overall policy. However, this item is definitely a cost attributable to fire department operation and should be reflected in its budget. Thirty-eight cities excluded this item from their fire department budget.

City Contribution to Retirement. Thirty-seven cities excluded this cost from their fire department budget. Figuring very conservatively, 6% of the yearly payroll for fire department personnel reflects a considerable sum to be paid by the taxpayer.

Fire Station Construction. In some cases this is taken care of by bond issue, which does not reflect in the fire department budget, BUT very definitely makes an appearance in the tax bill to the citizens. In a fast growing area, or in an area that has been allowed to deteriorate, a false economy

usually exists and these costs can be very high. In 35 cities studied, these costs were not shown as a fire department expense.

Workman's Compensation Insurance. With the cost of this insurance predominating at an average rate of \$2.80 per hundred dollars of payroll for uniformed fire fighters; and noting that 35 cities did not include this cost in their fire department budgets, we were able to come up with a fair estimate of another cost that can be directly applied to operation of a fire department.

Hydrant Purchase, Installation, Repair, Rental, and Water Use. These costs are very definitely an expense to the taxpayer, and chargeable directly to the departmental budget. Reference is made to the book entitled "Municipal Fire Administration," Chapter 5, pages 175 to 182. Under the sub-heading, Cost of Water Service for Fire Protection, paragraph two reads as follows: "It has been found that the portion of the cost of the physical plant of the waterworks system provided solely because of fire protection needs constitutes from 60% to 80% of the entire cost of the physical property of the waterworks in the communities having less than 10,000 population, 30% to 40% in cities having about 50,000 population, 20% to 30% in cities of 100,000 population, and 10% to 20% in the large cities." This book, written by the International City Managers Association, makes this statement, and yet the cities do not reflect this cost in their department budgets.

Capital Outlay for Other than Station Construction.

This cost reflects mainly purchases of new fire equipment, apparatus, and fire alarm systems. Since these items are used directly for fire department purposes, their cost should also be directly reflected in the budget. In the case of bond issues to cover purchase of this type of equipment, the fire department budget should reflect the bond retirement costs per year, plus interest.

Utilities, Telephone Expenses, Miscellaneous Items.

Such costs as repair expenses, radio maintenance and repair, and dispatching expenses, are all items which many times are now shown as a direct expense to the fire department. They are usually charged off to other departments as part of their duties. In a logical approach to show true costs of fire protection, all of the above costs should appear in the fire department budget.

PRESENT FIRE PROTECTION DEFICIENCIES

Inefficient Response

Perhaps the most fundamental problem resulting in numerous inefficient responses is that the closest apparatus is not sent to the fire due to municipal boundary lines and the odd shapes of many cities within the county. The greater portion of the Los Angeles metropolitan area is criss-crossed with boundary lines of many cities and unincorporated areas. This results in odd shaped jurisdictions which are extremely difficult to protect adequately. In many cases engine companies will respond 1 1/2 miles to 2 miles to a fire that is as close

as 1 or 2 blocks from an adjoining city's station. This overlap results in a needless duplication of cost to the taxpayer and very possibly a much greater probability of loss of life and property.

In the picture on the screen now, the black dots graphically illustrate the problem of too many stations in a given area. The three-quarter mile radius circles indicate the response distances of each station and you can readily see the overlap of the stations' jurisdictional response area. That is based on the minimum requirements. The pictures in the circles are indicated on the basis of minimum requirements of the Board of Underwriters.

Inefficient Station Location

Only stations within a particular city's boundaries are recognized as fire protection for that city by the National Board of Fire Underwriters. There are some cases where fire stations of different cities are now located, or will be located, only blocks apart. If the National Board of Fire Underwriters' minimum distance standards are used in each political jurisdiction, then costly over-coverage of some areas usually results.

As indicated in this picture, these two fire stations are less than three blocks apart and each one of them cover almost an identical area. The station in the lower left of the intersection is a county station, and the other is a Culver City station.

Yet this coverage is still technically mandatory in each jurisdiction in order to obtain the lowest fire insurance rates for the taxpayers.

Communications

Revision of communication systems in Los Angeles County is very important. In 1953 there were 12 separate fire department radio frequencies and 17 police-fire radio frequencies, a total of 29 different frequencies used by fire departments in the county. Because of FCC restrictions, fire departments have a difficult time securing new frequencies due to the large number now in use. As a result of these different frequencies, peak efficiency is retarded in many cases when different fire departments are operating on the same fire. Incoming equipment is virtually impossible to direct, and strategic locations cannot be assigned without still further delay. Overlapping telephone exchanges are often the cause of fires being reported to the wrong departments. This, of course, causes much delay and confusion before the proper agency is dispatched to the emergency. Under circumstances activated by an atomic attack or by a large scale conflagration or earthquake, coordination of fire fighting forces would be nothing less than chaotic.

Apparatus and Equipment

The California Fire Equipment Standardization Act standardizes such things as hose couplings, hose sizes, type of threads, hydrants, etc. Items such as types of equipment or apparatus, location of equipment, quantity of hose, and amount of water carried on apparatus, are not considered. The importance of these items are readily seen when a chief officer in charge of a large fire is forced to make quick decisions on

where to locate equipment on the fire line. If non-standardized equipment is responding to, or at the scene, it is impossible for the officer in charge to know which apparatus has the necessary equipment to efficiently carry out an assigned task.

Training

Very few of the fire departments in Los Angeles County have formal training programs. Many departments send their recruits directly to the fire stations without any form of training. In fact, only 11 departments have formal recruit training programs. Fire departments that do have recruit training give their new men from two to ten weeks training in the fundamentals of fire fighting before sending them to active duty. There is a serious lack of standardization in regard to training fire fighters and it seems logical that with the increased use of intermunicipal fire protection, men cannot work efficiently side by side if they are trained to do the job differently.

Pay, Hours, and Retirement Systems

In the metropolitan area of Los Angeles it would seem reasonable that all firemen should work the same hours and receive the same compensation for doing the same type of work. Small departments in the area have a difficult time recruiting and retaining personnel due to the lure of better salaries and the shorter work week offered by the larger departments. Retirement systems also vary between cities and could be standardized so that all firemen would receive the same benefits.

Fire Prevention

This important fire department activity is generally given very light treatment in the smaller city fire departments. Few, if any, other than the Los Angeles City Fire Department, have 100% fire prevention coverage. Vast improvements in fire prevention activities would result in the inception of a metropolitan fire department organization.

PREVIOUS STUDIES OF METROPOLITAN AREAS

Early studies have shown that metropolitan areas need centralized departments in order to give better and more efficient service at reasonable costs. Results of these studies, some dating back to the early part of the century, disclosed in many cases that consolidated functional jurisdiction is vital and necessary to public emergency services. Again it was pointed out in most of these studies that jurisdictions requesting outside aid on fires have serious limitations due to the probability that aid will not be asked for until life is in jeopardy or excessive damage has already been done. Research has shown that smaller municipalities ordinarily are not able to pay for expert emergency services, and that metropolitan needs cannot adequately be provided without some degree of centralized control. Six other studies and reports made on this subject by interested organizations came to very similar conclusions. Most major conclusions in these studies stated that a metropolitan areawide fire service is not only feasible, but is probably the most efficient and economical type of service available for the taxpayer.

Since 1953, legislative modifications pertaining to consolidation of fire services have pinpointed a definite interest in this subject throughout the state. The 37 studies of this area compiled to date, with one exception, recommend that immediate action be taken in the consolidation of protective services. The lone exception agreed with the consolidation principle, but recommended further study.

A METROPOLITAN FIRE DEPARTMENT
for
LOS ANGELES COUNTY

Fire departments have the responsibility to protect the lives and property of all individuals as well as other related disaster measures in the event of an emergency of catastrophic proportions. Logically then it is reasonable to assume that a continued analysis should be made of the resources that are necessary to fulfill this responsibility as the greater Los Angeles basin becomes more populated. Our civil defense program for this area is an excellent example of the problems confronting us in the efficient control of a disaster situation. The coordination of some 47 different fire departments that use 29 or 30 different radio frequencies, that have no standard pattern for training, that use non-standardized fire fighting equipment, would be an almost impossible task in the event of a major disaster or conflagration.

At the present time the awkward boundary lines of incorporated and unincorporated areas present a serious problem in jurisdictional response. In the Los Angeles area there are

many instances when the nearest fire company to a family dwelling or a business location does not respond in an emergency because of its jurisdictional limitations.

A metropolitan fire service for this area would dissolve many of the unnecessary expenses and anxieties that are now imposed on the taxpayer due to the overlapping of fire protection services.

Standardization of fire prevention methods and basic training procedures for fire fighting personnel would increase the effectiveness of handling the overall fire problem.

Still other advantages to the taxpayer would be the probable reduction of administrative costs due to a modernized and streamlined organization that would handle this consolidated function. Lower unit cost purchasing and more efficient handling of supplies would result from volume purchasing and up-to-date methods of warehousing. Fire dispatching service with improved techniques would be utilized.

A possible disadvantage may stem from the feeling of loss of "local autonomy". Actually, however, this would not be a realistic disadvantage, because a unified service will give individual and personalized service to all areas and communities. Any added costs will be offset by better fire ratings and the resulting reductions in fire insurance premiums due to the more efficient distribution of fire fighting personnel and equipment.

As stated in the study, a number of methods were proposed as possible solutions to the problem of basic organization and administration in a metropolitan-wide organization.

The metropolitan authority type of administration or the special fire district type of organization seems to be best suited to effectively cope with the problem.

LANTERMAN: Captain, at this time I am going to ask the courtesy of your indulgence. Supervisor Hahn is here and would like to be excused. We can pick up on your findings and conclusions just as soon as he has made his presentation. Supervisor, if you will come around and come up on the stage, you may make your presentation now.

SUPERVISOR KENNETH HAHN, 2nd Supervisorial District, Los Angeles County: I am Kenneth Hahn, a member of the Board of Supervisors of Los Angeles County, representing the Second Supervisorial District.

LANTERMAN: Very well, proceed Supervisor.

HAHN: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, I first of all want to commend this committee for its public focus on a very serious problem. Now I realize that this distinguished chairman, Mr. Lanterman, has supported legislation over a period of years in Sacramento for efficiency and economy, and if my memory serves me correct, I believe you were the author of a constitutional amendment which was supported by the Board of Supervisors to permit a Metropolitan Fire District for Los Angeles County. Then to your left I see Mr. Seth Johnson who was a member of the Los Angeles City Fire Department for many years, and a member of the Police and Fire Protective League. When I was a councilman for the city for

three terms, I served one of those terms on the Police and Fire Committee and, therefore, have knowledge of Mr. Johnson's expert experience in this particular field. The committee is fortunate to have Seth on it and to have the benefit of his professional advice.

LANTERMAN: Supervisor, so that you will know the members of the Committee, beginning at the far right is the Hon. Roy Nielsen, a former councilman of the city of Sacramento and an honored member of this committee; the Hon. Jim Holmes from the city of the gay cavaleros, Santa Barbara; next, the chairman of the full committee, the Hon. Clark Bradley, who is the former Mayor of the City of San Jose. I think you will understand then that we have before us people who are knowledgeable in the problems, and that the background of the study is primarily for the purpose of discussion to bring to light all the facts that we can relating to the problem, without taking a position pro or con.

HAHN: I am certainly glad to know of the excellent background of the other members of the committee, because of the fact that it gives them a knowledge of city, as well as state and county, responsibilities in this problem.

LANTERMAN: Mrs. Harrison, our secretary, has been the secretary of this committee for many years through Earl Stanley's regime, and through Mr. Bradley's, and she knows the background of this too. If you get into any hole that you can't pull out of, Cristine will give you the answers too, I am sure. Go ahead, Kenny.

HAHN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for these instructions and I certainly want to renew my friendship with each of the members of the committee.

I particularly would like to call the attention of the committee to the fact that this problem was first brought to me not as a County Supervisor, but when I was a member of the City Council. It began in 1947 in this city of Los Angeles when the former Chief of the Fire Department, John Alderson, who is considered one of the number one experts in America, gave me the original idea of this problem. He thought that the overlapping duplication of fire services in this area was expensive and inefficient. Then when I became a County Supervisor, I talked to the late Cecil Gehr, who was the County Fire Chief. Both of these outstanding men told me that it was in the best professional standing of the fire fighters, and professional firemen, to have a unified service.

Now I am convinced, and I think the public is convinced, that the only way to bring effective meaningful tax reduction is through the elimination of duplication and overlapping of services of state, county, city, special districts, and the Federal Government. I believe many millions of dollars could be saved each year through a single unified metropolitan fire department to serve all of this great area. Just how much, I do not know, but studies indicate that over a million dollars could be saved just on the buildings - the duplication of fire stations. We all know there is duplication of purchasing of

equipment, training of personnel, even the alarm boxes and the telephones, the size of hose, fire prevention codes, and even how far away to park from a fire plug. Some cities have ten feet and some have fifteen feet.

I think the need for consolidation is evident. This committee, I believe, could render a great public service of doing this, the bringing about of such a consolidation. We probably all agree that there is evidence that it needs to be done. Now, how to do it; that's the big question. As you know, in this county alone there are 46 cities which have their own fire departments - 46 of the 61 incorporated cities. Fifteen of them have contracts with the County Fire Department. Each of the 46 departments have their own fire chief, their own fire commission, their own equipment, their own alarm system, their own rescue service - all of that. Every city has that. Certain small cities might have truck equipment - hook and ladder truck equipment with an aerial water tower. Maybe they only have one building in the city, but because they are four or five stories high, under the Fire Underwriters code they must provide that service for them. I want to make it clear I am not criticising any single fire department, but only commenting that the method of the system itself needs correcting. I think that the very existence of the shapes, geological boundary definitions of the cities and the county, with the shoestring strips of cities connecting San Pedro and Los Angeles, connecting Westchester and Los Angeles, requires the

city of Los Angeles alone to have fire stations at remote spots to serve just a narrow piece of land and sometimes a few buildings. I forget, Mr. Johnson, the company located at 182nd and Vermont; I don't know whether it is 79 or 82. It's 79? And then at one time there was the fire station connecting the city of San Pedro with the main city - the Gardena area - and the calls sometimes, I think, ran as few as 30 or 40 a year, and generally they were just brush fires in that one area. I live right off Manchester and Figueroa in the city, and many times it is necessary for equipment located at fire stations in the county area east of Central Avenue, to respond to secondary calls in Lawndale and the south section of the county, and they cross the path of city fire stations enroute to county fires. Many times the city of Los Angeles Fire Department, such as the big unit Battalion Chief's Headquarters Company No. 66 on Florence near Western, traveling to a fire either at the International Airport or Westchester goes through the City of Inglewood and passes the Inglewood Fire Department on its way to fires within the city of Los Angeles on the other side of town.

I realize that there are many illustrations like that. I have in my own district, in which I have several cities plus unincorporated territory, many fire stations located adjacent to city boundaries, and it will often be found that other cities of the county may have a fire station within a short distance. There are four stations in one area - three

city stations and one county station - all within the radius of a mile and a half, in my district; three city stations and one county, all within a mile and a half, right near the vicinity of El Segundo Boulevard and Western-Crenshaw. The city of Inglewood has one; the city of Hawthorne has one; the city of Gardena is building a new one; and the county has a fire station there - all because of the recent annexations or incorporations. Within a mile and a half we have three different agencies. Now I know that this committee knows much more about the details than I do; you have a trained staff member to give you the actual dope - the figures on it.

I think this is a very valuable step forward to start to reduce the tremendous cost in property taxes of the people who own property in California. People turn their tax bills over very rarely. They get their total bill and then blame some agency for it; but if they can start to give better service and reduce the property taxes, I think it would be a great public service.

I think that better fire fighting service could be had and savings could be given to the taxpayers for the following reasons: one, a more efficient use of the professionally trained firemen, the equipment and the fire service. Just the alarm boxes and the single telephone call are very important. Recently we found out on the county level that the Firestone Rubber Company, which is located at Alameda and Firestone Boulevard, was in the unincorporated area of the county of Los Angeles, and that they made a contract with the city of

Southgate, which has four fire engines - four pieces of fire fighting equipment - for contract fire service, so as not to be in the County Fire District and pay the uniform fire district tax. On December 26, I believe, they had a \$300,000 fire and the county had to respond with 13 pieces of equipment, plus the equipment in the city of Southgate. It was called out, and the Chief's report to the Board indicated that the delay caused through lack of knowledge as to which department to call resulted in a couple of minutes. Although a couple of minutes is a short period of time, it can be costly in a big fire, as you well know. This fire alone cost the company over \$300,000. There should be one method of communication.

In the training of personnel I think the county has taken the leadership in allowing the use of our training facilities to any small city that wants to use it. Some cities use the training facilities and some do not. Just the loan of the County Purchasing Agent, and the County system of buying equipment on competitive bids by unit price, would be of tremendous savings to the county.

The committee should also understand this problem. The County charter, which is adopted by the people of all this county, requires that the County Fire Department respond to fires anywhere in the county, whether in a County Fire Protection District or not, or whether they are in a city or not.

The Charter requires the County Fire Department to respond to any structural fire, if there is a need. Now this important factor I would like to bring to the attention of the committee - I just found out this morning that approximately one-fifth of the area in the unincorporated territory of this county alone is not in any fire district. They don't belong to a city so therefore they are not paying a city tax, and as you all know - you people who have served on city councils and as mayors - city government provides for a fire department out of the city budget, and therefore there is no special tax for the fire department in the city; while in the county unincorporated areas, a person normally has to belong to a district to get fire protection, and for this he pays a special tax. In this case, however, it means that one-fifth of the assessed valuation of this county is getting fire protection, which is guaranteed to them by the charter, in case they have a structural fire, but they are not paying any fire district tax.

The assessed valuation within our own district is \$2,400,000,000. The assessed valuation of this unincorporated area that is not in a district is over \$631,000,000. We can describe this in terms of loss of revenue to the rest of the taxpayers - the little home owners and the small businessmen who have to pay the county fire protection tax; and it represents a spread of nearly \$4,000,000 that is not coming into the County Fire Department. That would mean that if this area was in a district and paying its fair share of taxes, in the unincorporated territory alone there would be a reduction of the

County Fire District rate from 62 cents per \$100 down to 47 cents. The most important factor, I think, for this committee, other members of the Legislature, and the people of California, to consider is that this would bring about a better service at a lower tax rate.

The big problem that this committee wants to overcome - the big hurdle - is the method to be found to do it. I think this committee started in in the right way, holding hearings and having various people come and talk. Maybe the solution would be to have this Assembly committee perform a distinguished service to the taxpayers of the county by providing the authority for continuing study, and then make recommendations to the Legislature either by a constitutional amendment, or other legislation, urging cities to consolidate with the county. There probably could be four ways to do it: (1) the 46 cities could join the County Fire Protection District now and contract with the County Fire Department to provide this service; (2) the cities could join the Fire Protection District - be a part of the district and not contract - such as the 15 cities that are presently served by the Department, and the county could probably operate the fire department with the general fund financing; and the last would be the creation of a metropolitan fire department which would be an authority either created by the State by a constitutional amendment, or by some other method.

To be very practical, I would say that the Los Angeles City Fire Department is about the finest fire department

of its kind in America; and the County Fire Department ranks, with its manpower, its training, its ability, and the number of pieces of equipment which it has, no less than the finest county fire department that exists in the United States. We realize that. To take both of these departments and consolidate them at this time would seem to be a very major undertaking, but if we could go in steps - maybe have the smaller cities, smaller areas, join a metropolitan fire department until the problem works out - we could later on urge the city to join it.

I know the committee will be presented with some of the problems that have been presented to me over the past eleven years. What about the person's pension rights who has been on the police force or in the fire department for a long time? What about the fire chiefs - who gets to be the fire chief. Now that's a real serious one, although we might smile, but who actually will be the head of the fire department? What about the people who are building up their salaries? One fire department in a small city has a different salary scale than you have in others, so what base salary will be used? Then you have the fears of firemen and fire departments for their civil service protection. I think they simply would have to insure by a constitutional amendment that the existing firemen and their seniority and their pensions and their salaries would be protected; otherwise you can immediately see that every city would oppose this, and it would be difficult to push forward.

I think there is also a problem that we must face - all of us who have been in public office will pretty well agree to this - that you will have a fear of local autonomy, local control, local pride, in the small cities that feel very proud and won't be ignored. They feel that they can really do a better service for their people, and you know that whether you are from the smallest city in the county or the largest one, you have that fear of, "Well, we have a good fire department now but we might have second rate protection if we join a larger area. We also fear that we might lose some of the tremendous pride that the people have in a small fire department which is doing a good job, although it is very costly to the taxpayer."

Then there is the difficulty - and this is a practical one that this committee will be faced with - the difficulty of equalizing the tax base for the whole area, particularly those areas with either extreme high or extreme low evaluation. That will be a big problem for this committee to work out - an equalized tax structure for it.

Then probably the last, you will have the reluctance and fear, Mr. Chairman, of people who feel that a metropolitan fire department would be so large, would be so unwieldy, that the efficiency of a small fire department would be lost; and communities would feel that they would not be guaranteed the type of fire service they have been accustomed to. That would be a real practical one - the people who would be fearful that they would not receive the type of service that they have been used to.

Some cities, as you know, Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, have their fire departments do rescue work for heart attacks and for other types of illnesses. Some cities do not. Some cities have a fire department ambulance service for traffic accidents and will respond to the scenes of traffic accidents, like the city of Los Angeles Central Receiving Hospital. I think even in Los Angeles the Los Angeles City Fire Department now has ambulance units in the San Fernando Valley that respond to traffic accidents, shootings, suicides, and all other emergency cases.

So, you will have these fears of city areas losing that particular type of service; but I think, in conclusion, that this committee can work out these problems of resistance and fears of the problems I spoke about, and yet guarantee to the county and to the people of this great metropolitan area a unified fire department. This would be a great forward step in professional fire fighting, and I also think that the insurance rates that everyone pays for their little homes and their businesses could be reduced. Many areas have a high insurance rate because of the fire protection in that area, which could be reduced. Eventually, I predict that if we are successful in this county and have a metropolitan area, that will be of great service. I do want to emphasize this, that in any serious fire - and Los Angeles County has had probably the most serious fire in California's history in the Malibu fire - a great deal of fire equipment is sometimes needed. I believe that 200 different

units from various agencies responded from all over the state to assist the county in the Malibu fire. It shows that they can cooperate in actually fighting fires, and they do a good job under their mutual aid agreements of assisting other cities; but the big thing is the administration of it and cutting down that cost. That, I am sure, will be a tremendous problem that your committee will study.

At this time I want to thank you, Mr. Lanterman, for your leadership in this particular field and inviting me to appear.

LANTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hahn. Supervisor, may I ask a couple of questions of you? You mentioned the Firestone Company fire, indicating that the factory had a contract with the adjacent city for fire service, and yet when the fire occurred, they had a number of companies - 11 or 12 - come in from the county. The question I would like to ask is, is the Firestone plant in the Consolidated Fire District?

HAHN: Mr. Chairman, to explain it, at the present time they are in because the Fire Chief so requested (and by the way, the Firestone Rubber Company is fighting this annexation to the County Fire District now). It's a technical problem and I might take a minute to explain it. The Firestone Rubber Company is in the unincorporated part of the County but was not in the County Fire District.

LANTERMAN: They were never a part of the Consolidated Fire District?

HAHN: Right.

LANTERMAN: All right

HAHN: But to protect their insurance, they contracted with the city of Southgate for \$30,000 a year if the city of Southgate would send their municipal equipment into the county area to fight it and therefore protect their insurance rate. I brought this argument to the Board when the Firestone Rubber Company opposed it. And by the way, they are now in the fire district and there are hearings up in two more weeks for their withdrawal. I contend that either a company like that should be in a city, annexed to a city, and receive all municipal services and pay all municipal taxes, or, if they are going to stay in the county and receive county benefits, then they should be in a county fire protection district. They can't get the benefits of county government on one side, take a contract with a city for a lower fire bill on the other, and not pay their fair share.

By the way, the big \$50,000,000 General Motors plant at Tweedie and Alameda was in the same condition for many years. They also made a contract with the city of Southgate. They were also in the county area but would not pay county fire taxes. Because of these hearings, they have formally annexed, or are in the procedure of annexing, to the city of Southgate for all municipal purposes. I am a firm believer, Mr. Lanterman, that an industry should either be in a city and pay municipal taxes like all other industries and home owners, or, if they want to remain in the county, they should pay their fair share of county fire protection taxes. I have felt that it was unfair

and unjustified to have the small owners providing county fire department services in a community, and the largest industry in there is not paying the tax. For the information of the Chairman, Firestone now is in the County Fire Protection District.

LANTERMAN: Will Firestone then annex to the city of Southgate and solve their problems the same way?

HAHN: I asked the legal representative of the company that question and they are not willing at this time to say so, but General Motors have started the proceedings to do that.

LANTERMAN: I see. Are there any questions by members of the Committee? Yes, Mr. Bradley.

BRADLEY: Mr. Hahn, do you have any idea what the difference in the tax rate was that the Firestone people were raising the issue over?

HAHN: Yes, I'll try to answer that to the best of my ability. We've debated this quite heavily on the Board. Firestone and General Motors were both in my district on Alameda Boulevard. Some of you know where the Firestone plant is - the other side of their plant borders on the city of Southgate - I mean, the boundary line is on the other side of the street. Well, they made a contract with the city saying, "If we have a fire, would you respond?" knowing full well that the county which has a fire station five-tenths of a mile away will roll in immediately if the fire is too big, under the Mutual Aid agreement. That's No. 1. No. 2, under the county

charter, the County Fire Department is required to fight all structural fires whether they are in the county or not. They have had this agreement for many years - 20 or 25 years - and the difference is that they would have to pay the usual fire protection tax rate in the county which is 62 cents per \$100 valuation. That is the fire district tax rate in Los Angeles County. That's for everybody - the small home owner, a small business, or a large one; everyone in the County Fire District pays that tax rate. Roughly, this is what they saved by the contract: they paid a flat \$30,000 a year, and if they were in the County Fire District they would have had to pay about \$70,000, or better, at the tax rate of the county. They saved \$30,000 to \$40,000 a year by adopting this method. I raised the legal point on the Board and I know it is not something for this committee to take its time on, but I raised the legal question, "Well, what if every major industry would do that, where would our county fire protection be and where would the small cities be?" You see these cities which enjoy a certain rating - and you know more about this than I do - have a fire defense plan in their district, but if they have an industrial plant with a large assessed valuation, then they have to have so many additional pieces of equipment, alarm systems, hydrants, and all the rest of it to protect it. Am I correct, Mr. Johnson? They have to have all that. Now, if a small city does not have such a plant in their legal incorporated area but can make an outside contract across the line, their fire insurance rating

in that city is still the same without the additional equipment, and they receive this extra \$30,000 a year to run their local fire department. This means that the rest of the county area, which is across the street, is paying for that particular protection. I thought that this was maybe even unconstitutional about the property taxes - of people paying for a service and helping someone else with their's, but the Board did decide to put the Firestone Rubber Company in the district, and we did that in December. By the way, they filed their notice of withdrawal the day before Christmas, Christmas Eve, December 24. On December 26 they had the \$300,000 fire - at the very hour that they filed the papers with the Board. The Clerk of the Board called me later on to say, "Mr. Hahn, did you know that the Firestone Rubber Company called to put in their papers, but later on, after the big fire had hit all of the newspapers, they called up and said could they withdraw those papers." They realized that the County Fire Department had sent all its heavy equipment in there to extinguish the fire.

This was quite important to me, to know that one-fifth of the county assessed valuation is not in any fire protection district and is not paying any fire taxes at all and letting other people carry the burden.

HOLMES: One question please. Mr. Hahn, were they able to do this simply because they were not in any district - any fire district?

HAHN: They were in the county, in the unincorporated area, but they never annexed themselves to a County Fire District.

HOLMES: Well, anyone who is in a fire district could not withdraw from that district and come into a city, could they - and contract with the city?

HAHN: Well, I imagine, Mr. Holmes that the laws of California, which the Legislature has passed, provide that anyone in a county fire district has the right to petition the board to withdraw from the district, and that is what they are doing now. So, you could take plant after plant and have a community near by with a small fire department and say, well, we'll do this, but you come in - knowing that the whole fire department has to come in anyway. Certainly it was in General Motors favor and in Firestone's favor to have this policy for 20 years, and I never heard about it until just a few months ago. Then County Fire Chief Klinger recommended that they either come into the County Fire Protection District or be a part of the city. You people have been in city government; you have been mayors and councilmen, and you realize this that a large industry presents many problems, not only for the fire department but for traffic control, street cleaning, police protection, water problems, and every other municipal problem. If an industry wants to stay in the county, then they should pay the county taxes, and if they want to go over to a city, then they should pay all the city taxes. They can't very well separate them.

LANTERMAN: Well, Supervisor, I think that the purpose of our hearing is primarily to do just as you have done,

bring in all of these aspects of the metropolitan area's problem, and regardless of what we succeed in doing, regardless of what permissive legislation we achieve, or can bring about, it certainly will reflect some useful material upon a metropolitan area's problems, regardless of what metropolitan solution is ultimately geared for that metropolitan area. Actually what we are doing is taking one phase, and we are also going into the contract system of the county, for which there has been both praise and criticism, to find ways and means to get the facts. That's all we want to do. Thank you very much, Supervisor.

HAHN: Mr. Lanterman, I certainly think that the time to do it without any big serious crisis, say of a breakdown in the fire protection service, or lack of cooperation, is now. I think this is the sound administrative way to do this. I also think this way, that if the committee will carry this through, it will lead and show the way for other standing committees of the Legislature and for the municipal and county governments of California to consolidate and to eliminate the duplication of many other services.

LANTERMAN: We'll get the facts if they want to use them, and then it is up to them.

HAHN: And I congratulate you for it.

LANTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hahn.

JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I wonder if I may comment for just a second. I want to particularly thank the Supervisor for coming down. I have had, as he said, the privilege of working with him for a good many years

HAHN: Seven years.

JOHNSON . . . and he certainly has been the champion from the standpoint of the fire service, and was terrifically interested during some of the difficulties we were having for a while. Kenny, I want to thank you very much for coming up personally because you have some very fine background and I like the way you work. You have always been of great assistance to me and I appreciate it very much.

HAHN: Thank you, Mr. Johnson. As you all know, Mr. Johnson was very active down here, and I don't know of a better person in the Legislature, from the professional fireman's point of view, than Seth Johnson.

LANTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Hahn. We will now continue with Captain Smith. Will you go ahead with your presentation please?

CAPTAIN FRED SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Lanterman.

LANTERMAN: I'm sorry that we found it desirable to proceed with that interruption, but I am sure you appreciate it had to be done.

SMITH: Certainly.

ALBERT ALBERTONI: Mr. Lanterman, before Captain Smith proceeds with his recommendations and findings, I would like to compliment Supervisor Hahn on pointing up a problem which we have recognized for a long time in the fire service. As most of you people know, I am also a Captain in the fire service with some 20 years background in one of our largest fire

departments in California, and it is my firm opinion and conviction that the purpose of mutual aid is not to allow major private industry to evade its fair share of the tax burden. In too many instances mutual aid is being taken advantage of for that specific purpose, and that in my opinion is one of the disadvantages of mutual aid. There should be some restriction put upon it - some limitation put upon it. The purpose of mutual aid is to take care of major conflagrations and catastrophes, but not to allow major private industry to evade its fair share of the tax burden.

LANTERMAN: Well, that's up to local government to straighten those angles out. I don't think this committee should interfere in the mutual relationships between these two agencies. If there is some legislation that is permissive, that they deem necessary to expand, for instance, then that would be our field. Thank you for your comment. Go ahead, Captain.

SMITH: Thank you. I'll continue with our presentation.

FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Because of the many complex jurisdictional boundary lines that have come about by the aforementioned growth factor, it has become increasingly necessary to re-evaluate fire protection needs in the Los Angeles metropolitan area.

We believe that the elimination of these boundary lines through the establishment of a Metropolitan Fire Department will save taxpayers substantial amounts of money each year by:

- a. an efficient realignment of station locations,
- b. reducing cost of fire insurance in most areas, and
- c. possible reduced costs of administration and the elimination of the need for double taxation in some cities.

Comparison of actual cost data for fire protection of our two largest departments with that of the smaller departments has shown that it would not be too expensive to provide a high level of protection for the entire metropolitan area.

We have brought out numerous deficiencies in fire protection as it exists today in the metropolitan area resulting from the fact that (1), there are numerous fire stations located ineffectively, (2) there is a lack of inter-departmental communication facilities, (3) apparatus and equipment is not standardized (4) a serious lack of standardized training, (5) a serious differential of salaries and working conditions causing a continual migration of fire fighters to more lucrative positions in larger departments, (6) there are many different fire prevention codes in use causing confusion among the citizens, and (7) mutual aid is not the answer to problems of everyday fire protection. We believe that a Metropolitan Fire Department will eliminate these deficiencies as outlined earlier in this report.

Problem Areas---Need for Future Study

1. Retirement Systems. When this report was completed in 1956, there were serious problems relating to the subject of retirement. During the last session of the Legislature, AB 3998 was passed and enacted into law. This new statute has eliminated

most of the retirement problems and leaves only the problem of the three cities that have their own private retirement systems; Los Angeles, Pasadena and Long Beach. A number of the Long Beach fire fighters are protected by AB 3998, but the remainder are under the old original Long Beach system. The problem of these three cities probably can best be handled through charter amendments in each city or through the use of the Joint Powers Act. It would understandably be beneficial to establish an entirely new system for a Metropolitan Fire Department.

2. Fire Insurance Grading. The answer to this problem can probably best be answered by representatives of the Board of Fire Underwriters. We understand they have been invited to testify before this committee at this hearing. It is reasonable to assume that a Metropolitan Fire Department based on the minimum standards of the Board of Fire Underwriters would result in a reduced fire insurance cost to the citizens of this vast metropolitan area.

LANTERMAN: May I inform you at this time, Captain, that the Fire Underwriters representative has agreed to answer questions, but does not desire to make a formal presentation on a matter of this general nature.

SMITH: Thank you.

LANTERMAN: Proceed.

SMITH: Continues reading)

3. Integration of the Fire Chiefs. Each city has its own fire chief and many have deputy chiefs, assistant chiefs, and/or battalion chiefs. We have prepared a tentative organizational chart in an attempt to determine manpower needs for a Metropolitan Fire Department. (The chart shown on this screen was designed not to display a total and complete organization but to provide the committee with an idea of the type of administration that could be used for a metropolitan fire department.) The 140 chiefs indicated in the report will probably be increased as a result of another reevaluation of conditions. Here again the growth factor must be considered because most of the fire departments have increased in size since the study was first presented.

Even though many of the fire chiefs in the small cities have few firemen in their command and are receiving only a rate of pay comparable to a captain in one of the major fire departments, there would still be some loss of prestige and freedom of activity that the fire chiefs now enjoy. At least three of these cities which have volunteer fire departments have chiefs that devote only part of their time to this position. Specifically, two are employees of the police department in their respective cities, and one is a water department official.

It might also be noted that many of these chiefs are nearing retirement age; or in fact, have previously retired from other fire departments, and would not elect to remain in the metropolitan department. At any rate, it would be imperative

to integrate all of the chiefs who so desired into the metropolitan department with no loss of compensation. It is probable that if a study is made of this problem, perhaps by the chiefs themselves, a satisfactory answer would result.

4. Tax Basis. In our report we mention the problem of how to have a fair tax base. We speak of cities with extremely high assessed valuation as opposed to the cities with low assessed valuation. Since the completion of this report, we have found that a metropolitan fire department should be based on one area-wide tax rate. The present method of equalizing assessment values, in our opinion, is a fair and equitable manner in which to distribute the cost of operating such a department.

Recently in San Francisco the Mayor of London stated that the rich areas of London were assessed an additional tax so that the blighted areas could be provided an adequate level of service.

5. Control Over the Type of Fire Protection Desired by the City. Many citizens and many public officials seem to fear that local autonomy will be threatened by metropolitan operation of some of the major services such as fire protection. As you are aware, this subject has been a matter of discussion for many years. Many citizens, especially the long-time residents of the suburban communities, may feel that the municipality belongs to them and that they have played the only part in making their city a good place to live.

The association believes that this is not a realistic approach to this problem. Moreover, most citizens, particularly

the younger ones, think differently about these matters today. Since the community has developed into a widespread metropolitan area, they are used to moving from city to city, or city to unincorporated area, or vice versa, without paying a great deal of attention to boundary lines. They are confident that they will receive municipal type services in just about any area, and their feeling of pride has probably expanded to encompass the entire metropolitan area and not only a small segment of the area.

To make this picture complete, one must take into consideration the fact that existing jurisdictions with their staffs of officials and employees often constitute sources favoring retention of existing structure and opposing changes which might jeopardize their vested rights.

Superficial local pride and prejudice have often been a barrier to progress. Ways should and could be devised to alleviate this. Perhaps having the name of the community on the fire apparatus and stations would give said community and its citizens the desired recognition. Also, it might be possible to use fire apparatus in parades or other city functions. This could be accomplished even if the community were served by a metropolitan fire department, since there would always be reserve equipment and manpower available to move into and cover the city in the event of an emergency.

Recommendations

It will be noted in Section C of Chapter IV, that based on the findings resulting from this study, it is recommended that

steps be taken to allow for the ultimate functional consolidation of fire services within Los Angeles County. In this same section of the study we have presented three alternate plans for best establishing this functional consolidation. It would be appropriate at this time to state that since the study was completed in 1956, further contacts have been made with representatives of administration, political bodies, educators and interested citizens in conjunction with the problem of the type of governmental organization that would be best suited to administer to a metropolitan wide fire service. In almost all cases the parties contacted were in agreement on a Metropolitan Fire Authority type agency to most effectively carry out this administration.

It is also our belief that the problems stated in the preceeding section can be resolved if the true perspective of the problem is kept foremost in mind; namely, a higher level of service at a reasonable tax rate. We sincerely believe that if these various avenues of approach indicated in the study are explored objectively and realistically, a functional consolidation of fire services will be the ultimate result.

The entire population of this metropolitan area has an investment of millions of dollars in fire stations, rolling stock and equipment. It is imperative that every effort be made to utilize this investment to the greatest degree of efficiency to effect the lowest cost of operation.

In closing, we recommend that this committee take immediate steps to prepare the necessary legislation for enactment

at the 1959 session of the Legislature for the accomplishment of the desired goal.

Mr. Chairman, that completes our summary of the report that was presented to your committee in 1956. This was quite lengthy but we felt if we went into it as deeply as we did it would probably answer the majority of the questions the committee might have on it.

LANTERMAN: Well, Captain, I think you covered the ground pretty thoroughly. Are there any questions from the committee? Mr. Bradley.

BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, will Captain Smith be available for questions this afternoon?

SMITH: Yes, sir.

LANTERMAN: We are going to have some additional testimony, and we have at this time, Mr. Chairman, two people here who have asked the privilege of making their presentations this morning - one mayor and one immediate past mayor. Mayor Center of Redondo did ask to appear but his presentation will be primarily on the contract problems. Is he present? Yes, Mayor, would it be convenient for you to be present this afternoon?

MAYOR CENTER: Yes, it will be possible.

LANTERMAN: I presume your presentation will be on a broader subject, rather than just fire, and I think Mayor Peavey might like to make his presentation at this time in direct relation to the fire problem, if he so desires.

MAYOR CENTER: That is correct and I will be back this afternoon.

LANTERMAN: All right. Mr. Peavey, would you come up and make your presentation?

ALBERTONI: Mr. Chairman, might I briefly make this statement to answer Mr. Bradley's question. Paul Desautels is chairman of our county group here and Oscar Castorina is the President of our local organization. Captain Fred Smith and Ralph Eliaser, our economist, will be present during the full term of this hearing.

LANTERMAN: We will all have questions to ask you if you will be with us this afternoon. This is a matter of courtesy which we extended to the Supervisor, and we want to thank you, Hollis, for coming. We will have your presentation at this time because it is in direct relationship to the present issue. We will continue with your presentation, Mr. Albertoni, following this one.

Will you identify yourself for the record, Mr. Peavey?

HOLLIS PEAVEY, Mayor of the City of Downey: Chairman Lanterman and distinguished members of the panel, I am at the present moment city councilman for the city of Downey - the new city of Downey. I have a little more experience through my service in city government, having served on the city council in the city of Huntington Park for 12 years, from 1938 to 1950, during which time I twice served as mayor of that city.

I do appreciate the opportunity to present the independent cities' viewpoint of consolidation and our experiences in this matter so far. As you perhaps are not aware, Downey

incorporated on the 17th of December, 1956, and we have had the experience in Downey of being both under the Los Angeles County Fire Department and our own fire department. So we are happy to give you, for your information, the basis of our experience in the transition to our own fire department. I have some facts and figures which I have received from the surrounding cities as to the costs of their fire department, based against the cost that they would have were they under the Los Angeles County Fire Department.

I am sure that you are aware that the trend in business is to decentralize, and that is taking place all over the country. We feel that this should be the trend in government. The large governments, the large governing bodies, by the proof on your tax bill, show that they are the expensive type. The figures that I will give you in connection with this are based on figures given to me by the city clerks of the surrounding cities from their present tax bills.

There has been quite a bit of conversation about Dade County, Florida. They consolidated into a city-county government. At the U.S. League of Mayors Convention held in the Waldorf-Astoria last September, the Mayor of Miami, whose city was affected by this consolidation, being in Dade County, was not on the agenda but he asked for time and came to this convention. He said he would forewarn all cities that they not let this condition happen to them. I do not have a copy of his speech with me this morning, but if the committee would

care to have that, I presume that I could secure a copy containing the warning that was issued by the Mayor of Miami, Florida.

LANTERMAN: Will you see that our secretary gets a copy of that?

PEAVEY: I would be happy to. I have it in book form and if she could take it out of that book, I would be glad to get that for you. I might say that they had another referendum, I believe, this last month. I don't know what the outcome was but it was to relieve the situation that they had walked into, perhaps without knowing the implications. I don't know the outcome of that election.

Now I didn't get my presentation prepared because I didn't receive your written invitation until just a couple of days ago. It was held up, so I'll have to give you this from notes that I have gathered from different cities.

LANTERMAN: If you wish to make a formal presentation in written form, you can forward that, with the summary of your presentation, to the secretary of the committee.

PEAVEY: I would be glad to give you just a few items that I have here which will not take too much of your time; but I think, without anything other than the facts that we have secured for you, we would be glad to just present these figures on taxes so as to show the difference in the costs and the amounts of equipment that we have at this time.

I have just received this letter from the city of Southgate, and inasmuch as they were under discussion by the

representative from the county, you might be interested in that. The amount of their personnel is a total of 64. The Southgate Fire Department has the following equipment: a Seagrave pumper, 1000 gals., triple combination; a 1941 GMC fire rescue truck; a 1948 F1. pick-up truck; a 1948 Mack pumper; a Ford truck with a Hardy pump; a Seagrave pumper (1000 gal.); another Seagrave pumper ('52 model); a Ford Mainline, 4 door - those are Chief's equipment, I presume - 4 of those; a Ford station wagon; a custom 4 door car; and a Peter Pirsch Aerial Ladder Truck, which is a new piece of equipment - thirteen pieces entire. Our maintenance and operation runs \$28,890.15; salaries and wages, \$304,930.34; capital outlay, \$47,464.81; total expense for the year ending June 30, 1957, \$381,285.30.

Now I give you the cost against this by what it would cost if they were under the county, and no doubt would not have this amount of equipment, as the records show.

The tax rate, the total valuation, is \$72,755,840.00. At the cost of the Los Angeles County fire rate, based in round figures of 63 cents, because it figures at .6263 on your tax bill, the cost would be \$654,802.56 against the cost of Southgate's \$381,285.00.

Now moving over to Huntington Park, they have three fire stations; 50 men, 1 secretary, 4 pumpers, 3 sedans, 1 panel ambulance, 1 pick-up, 2 ladder trucks. Their total cost for 1957-58 is listed at \$375,295.00. The county fire rate for this city, based on their assessed valuation, would be \$394,873.00. Listed in their cost of operation for the past year was \$61,000.00 capital improvements.

In the new city of Downey we have an assessed valuation of \$90,000,000, plus unsecured of \$11,000,000. In round figures, if you will figure for ease of figuring the valuation at 100 million, based on the cost of what we would pay at the Los Angeles County rate, and which we were paying until we withdrew, it would figure about \$630,000. The county had, within the city of Downey, 1 station, 2 fire trucks, and 1 rescue unit. The city of Downey has since built two additional stations. We have a personnel of 55. We have six pieces of fire fighting equipment, plus the rescue wagon, that we took from the county, and we are operating for \$400,000 for the year. Now the basis of the actual costs show that the independent cities are operating at a less expense than they would were they to stay under the county fire protection.

Now I would like to submit this to you. I have here a letter from the city of Vernon. The city of Vernon has two fire stations, 82 firemen, 4 hose trucks, 5 pumpers, 1 rescue unit, 1 ladder truck, a fire alarm system and one fire alarm truck to service that, 2 Ford sedans and 1 pick-up truck. The cost to operate this for the city of Vernon is \$615,751. Now were they to be in the County Fire Protection District, based on their assessed valuation, that would jump from \$615,751 to \$1,368,871.75. That's quite a jump, gentlemen, that's quite an excessive cost to the taxpayers of any city.

This morning you have heard something here about the mutual aid pacts, so I have asked our Fire Chief to gather

some information for us. In our particular area we have contracts with the different cities - there are ten cities that contract - and they all have mighty fine equipment and mighty fine personnel who are well trained. These cities are Bell, Compton, Downey, Huntington Park, Lynwood, Maywood, Montebello, Southgate, Vernon, and Whittier. The city of Southgate adjoins us on the southwest and they have a station not too far from us. We have many times cooperated with them, and I might say this to you, that in the years I served on the council in Huntington Park, the great fire department of the city of Los Angeles always gave us help whenever we needed it, and I assure you that they would do so were a conflagration to arise in our particular area, or in any one of these cities, without any contracts with them. They have always come out whenever they were called, and a mighty fine department the city of Los Angeles has.

Now, getting back to our mutual aid pact, this is the amount of equipment that they have in these ten cities: 39 engine companies (pumpers); 4 hose wagons; 6 aerial ladders; 8 rescue units; 2 squad companies; for a total of 59. There is a total of 452 firemen, of which a minimum of 160 are on duty at all times. They cover an area of approximately 56 square miles and serve a population of approximately 400,000 people. The assessed valuation for this area is given to me here as \$714,000,000. The fire department budget for the ten cities for 1957-58 is \$3,500,000. All right, let's figure that

up at 63 cents and see what the entire cities would have to pay were they in the County Fire Protection District.

According to my figures, based at 63 cents, that would cost \$4,498,200 against \$3,500,000.

Now, let's speak of local fire protection control as against remote control if we were in the county. At the time that the city of Downey was in the county, our residents could not call a local telephone exchange and report a fire; they had to call the Angelus exchange over in East Los Angeles. In return, they called back into Downey and notified the fire department where to go. We maintained that that was wrong and the city of Downey offered to put in our own telephone if they would use it, and if the people of Downey could use that telephone. This the County Fire Department refused to do; they wouldn't have any part of it. A little bit later, if you will recall, in the area of La Mirada, some people who were not too far from the County Fire Department tried to put in a call, and they had to go through a mixture of telephone exchanges. The result of it was that the house burned down before the fire company arrived. That is what you have when you have remote control handled by somebody a good many miles away from the scene of action.

In fire prevention we found, when we had to take over with our fire department, that there had been little or no effort on the part of the county for fire prevention, and our department had to immediately go to work on that. There were

old incinerators, old barrels, and things that were used for incinerators. We found fire plugs in the middle of the block instead of being on the corners where they should be. And the fire plugs known as Jim Jones - there were plenty of those used instead of the regular fire plugs. Since we have taken over, the people in the city of Downey have been very proud; they are very happy with the marked difference of local control over control by remote telephone lines. The local firemen are interested in their community; they are interested in keeping down fires within an area that they can take care of.

I make no complaints against the firemen of the Los Angeles County Fire District. They no doubt do what they are told to do by the high command; but under a local fire district, they know what's going on within a given area and they proceed to have enough equipment right there at the time of the fire to take care of that situation - which we did not. Now mind you, gentlemen, here we were a city - when we incorporated we were a population of 89,300 and some. We have since had two annexations from areas that wanted to come into Downey. Now we are a city of around 97,000 people - at least they pay us state gas tax money on that number, and I don't think the State pays any money it doesn't think is due. Mind you, in that area with one station, 24 personnel, 2 pieces of fire fighting equipment and 1 rescue wagon, that is spread too thin by any rhyme or reason.

I notice that Supervisor Hahn said that there again there were three city stations and one county station. It would

be interesting to me to determine if those three city stations weren't operated more efficiently and cheaper than that one county station. I think perhaps the facts and figures, if figured out, might indicate that that might possibly be the case.

I present this to you gentlemen for your information. As Al Smith used to say, let's look at the record, and we have tried to get the records. There might be a slight variance in those figures from the 63 cents that I have used in compiling this against the .6263. It's so close there would be very little variance. In our assessed valuation in the city of Downey we have not been incorporated long enough, but we think our figures to you are very conservative. For the unsecured, we have had to use the high school records in that particular area, which amounted to \$11,000,000, but we believe that it will be closer to \$20,000,000 after we have another year's assessed valuation.

It has been a privilege and a pleasure for me to present these facts to you. I assure you that the people of the independent cities would hesitate very much in being taken over by any outside fire department or police department. We now have our own police department in Downey, with marked satisfaction to everyone concerned. The other cities are watching this particular session very closely because they too have fire departments and have operated very inexpensively compared to what they would be expected to do where they to be taken over by some outside agency.

I appreciate the privilege of being here with you, and I don't want to take any more of your time.

LANTERMAN: Mr. Peavey, would you answer a question for me for my own information? First, would it be possible for the committee to have a copy of the budget of your city? Is that available?

PEAVEY: Yes, sir.

LANTERMAN: In your budgetary procedure, do you include the items that the report alluded to which were not included in the fire costs within the cities? In other words, are all fire costs that you have related as to cost in the city of Downey, for instance, do they relate to the entire chargeable items?

Peavey; I think so, sir.

LANTERMAN: In the report, regardless of the merit or validity of the accusations or allusions in the report - that's not our purpose. It is only to find out whether or not the report is valid in some instances, such as, are civil service charges, fire liability insurance, retirement costs, fire station construction, workmen's compensation insurance, hydrant purchase, capital outlay for other than stations, and utilities and telephones segregated or are they a part, an inseparable part, of the budget? Does the budget of the city as a whole contain many of these related items since they relate to other services, or are they separated for the purpose of fire costs?

PEAVEY: Let me clarify this for you. We are a new city and we have had to start from scratch this year. We have had to purchase four pieces of fire equipment - six pieces rather -

four new ones and two that we picked up second hand, besides build two new fire stations. Those would be amortized over the years, naturally, not just this year.

LANTERMAN: Yes, it would be on an amortization basis, but you don't take all capital outlay and apply it in one lump for one year. That isn't the intent. As a matter of policy, does the City of Huntington Park, and the other cities with which you have been familiar, do they segregate these chargeable items as applying only to the fire department and its cost?

PEAVEY: Let me see. I must have that here somewhere.

LANTERMAN: Well, you can submit that to the committee. We would like to have that to check on the report's statement. Now you made another remark that you had one county fire station prior to your incorporation within the now city limits.

PEAVEY: That's right.

LANTERMAN: Or the limits prior to annexation.

PEAVEY: Prior to annexation, yes.

LANTERMAN: How many county fire stations within radius of call served that area? In other words, how many were located in radius area adjacent to the city?

PEAVEY: Within perhaps 15-20 minutes, or half an hour's drive?

LANTERMAN: No, I meant the radius requirement - the three-quarters of a mile radius.

PEAVEY: There is now one that was taken in by the annexation - one truck. They had another truck at the Los Amigos

Rancho which they kept there. They did not allow it to run on fires except up to the last fleeting moments when it was determined that Downey was to set up its own system. Then they allowed that to run on fires. There is one in Bellflower. .

LANTERMAN: How far was that from the . . . ?

PEAVEY: Oh, Bellflower is roughly about seven or eight miles. . . and I think there is one in Santa Fe Springs and one in Bell Gardens, but I'm not sure. There is one truck in Bell Gardens I believe.

LANTERMAN: In other words, within the judgment of the city council, there were not sufficient stations reasonably close - radius call, county stations, properly placed to serve the city.

PEAVEY: Nowhere near it.

LANTERMAN: What was your fire rate before - under the county? What was your classification?

PEAVEY: I am not sure.

LANTERMAN: Well, you can supply that to the Committee if you don't recall it.

PEAVEY: But that is the same now. It hasn't been changed.

LANTERMAN: It has not been changed?

PEAVEY: Not that I know of.

LANTERMAN: And you now have how many pieces of equipment?

PEAVEY: We have six pieces of equipment and three fire stations.

LANTERMAN: How long did it take you to get the equipment?

PEAVEY: About three or four months. The cities surrounding us loaned us equipment until such time as we could get our own on the job. However, we did purchase two pieces of secondhand equipment.

LANTERMAN: Did those cities have surplus equipment - was that it?

PEAVEY: They had some stand-by equipment that they could loan us and did loan us. We tried to get the County Fire Department to leave the equipment there, but we didn't get any cooperation from the County Fire Department in any way, shape or form.

LANTERMAN: The City Council requested the fire department, the County Fire Department, to leave the equipment that was already in the station that was within the boundaries of the city?

PEAVEY: That's right.

LANTERMAN: And that was not done. When you annexed, did you annex two more stations?

PEAVEY: We annexed one more station.

LANTERMAN: One more station.

PEAVEY: However, the county still keeps that station. It doesn't serve the city of Downey.

LANTERMAN: They still keep the station because it is an integral part of the area immediately outside?

PEAVEY: It covers the Rivera area, I believe.

LANTERMAN: I see, and as a matter of coverage then, they keep the station inside the city. That's for the other service.

PEAVEY: That's right.

LANTERMAN: Would the 63 cents that now exists, Mr. Peavey, in your opinion, as a consolidated type of cost, be the same if a consolidation were made generally? You quoted the cities in your area as having a tax base say of \$715,000,000. Would the rate of the county be automatically increased or would the tax base broaden the cost to the point where it would be more economical?

PEAVEY: From our experience with the county, I don't think they would cut the rate any. It might go up.

LANTERMAN: Are there any questions now by members of the Committee?

PEAVEY: I might add a little bit more, Mr. Chairman, regarding retirement. We are under the State Retirement System in the city of Downey, and by using their system, other firemen from surrounding areas, for the most part, could transfer from one department to another. However, the county does not use that system and they are not able to transfer and still keep their priorities for any length of service that they have built up. We have felt, by using the State system, that we are much better off, and we have been able to secure perhaps some of the top-flight firemen of cities in the county, much as we hated to proselyte; but we had to have a fire department and we had to

have it now, inasmuch as the State had passed the law that newly incorporated cities had to get out of the fire districts by a certain time or take it to a vote of the people. This is a law which we certainly feel should not have been passed as it strikes directly at the heart of home rule. Now we were able, with the assistance of some of the fine fire chiefs surrounding us, such as Chief Miller from Los Angeles, the Chief from Riverside, and the Glendale Fire Department - who helped us with our personnel board - to secure some very fine firemen. This being a new department, there was a chance for some of the good men who would have had to wait under the retirement system for somebody to die or retire, to come to Downey. With that opportunity of advancement, they were happy to come to Downey in our new system, and we were happy to have them. Due to that relationship, we have built up a very fine fire department.

JOHNSON: Mr. Chairman, I think we have some very pertinent questions which should be asked here; but rather than ask this gentleman, it seems to me that you have a gentleman in the audience who can give these answers and he expects to be here this afternoon. I would like to hear from Mr. John Colton of the Underwriters on some of the questions relative to insurance rates of companies that surround Downey and provide fire protection to the city of Downey.

LANTERMAN: We can get that; we wouldn't expect the Mayor to have all that.

PEAVEY: I assure you I didn't have too much time. . .

LANTERMAN: We appreciate your responding as quickly as you did, Mayor.

PEAVEY: I asked other cities to send me the information and tried to give it to you as information off their tax books and from their city clerks.

LANTERMAN I would appreciate it if you would take a look at your budget and find out whether all of the items that I alluded to are contained in a copy of this report. Does Mr. Peavey have a copy of your summary which you presented today, Captain Smith? Well, he can get a copy of that.

PEAVEY: You mean this one from the Federated Fire Fighters?

LANTERMAN: Yes. All that I am asking is whether these items that they refer to are included in your budget as a cost directly related to fire costs.

PEAVEY: I would say this to you, that the figures which we present to you are taken from the books of the city - either the finance department or from the city clerk's department, depending on their type of government.

LANTERMAN: The only question that I raise at all is simply by comparison of figures, Mr. Peavey, and that is relating to the county's budget of the consolidated fire district, it is required that they have every possible serviceable item charged to them down to a mill, from the standpoint of tax responsibility - and that may be one of the answers for the 62 or 63 cents. I don't know that but we are trying to find out.

PEAVEY: Well now, I might say this to you that there are some cities that are furnishing fire, police, and every other service, at a tax rate less than 63 cents, and I believe the city of Southgate, about which there was some discussion here today, will bear that out.

LANTERMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Peavey. Mr. Bradley would like to ask you a question.

BRADLEY: I think, Mr. Peavey, Mr. Lanterman was working toward a point which I wanted to ask you about. Do you have knowledge which you can give the committee today as to what the rate would be per \$100 of assessed valuation for the cost of your department in Downey? Do you have that figure?

PEAVEY: Let me say this to you, Downey is operating without any city tax rate this year. We have no city tax rate. The only figures that I have given to you are actual operating expenses. I haven't figured it out on the basis of the assessed valuation.

BRADLEY: In other words, this \$400,000 that you gave is just a rough estimate?

PEAVEY: No, sir.

BRADLEY: That would be the operation for 1957?

PEAVEY: That's right. That was given to me by the finance officer this morning. As a matter of fact, we have tried to include in that practically all the coverage. Whether or not that includes the capital investment, I am not

prepared to say, but it will be in our budget and I will be happy to furnish you with a copy of the entire city budget if you like.

LANTERMAN: Will you ask him, if you please, whether or not these items are allocated by direct cost to the fire charge and charged to the fire service, or whether some of these costs that we have indicated are spread as a base for the city as a whole, and therefore not allocated to the fire cost?

PEAVEY: These are allocated, I am sure, to the actual cost of operating our fire department.

LANTERMAN: We will appreciate having those figures, if we can, for comparison.

PEAVEY: We will be glad to furnish them.

LANTERMAN: Thank you very much, Mayor, for your presentation.

It is now twenty minutes past 12 o'clock, and if there is anyone who can't be heard this afternoon, who had been assured he could be heard this morning, and who can't be back this afternoon, we can delay the lunch call; otherwise we will proceed to a lunch recess and return at 2 o'clock.

FUNCTIONAL CONSOLIDATION
Los Angeles
February 27, 1958

Afternoon Session

LANTERMAN: The Subcommittee on Functional Consolidation will resume its hearings at this time. Mayor Center of Redondo, if you are here at this time, would you like to make your presentation? The Mayor will not be confined to the subject of the consolidation of the fire services, but will go into the broad basis of functional consolidation.

MAYOR LEE CENTER, Redondo Beach: I am Lee Center, Mayor of Redondo Beach. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, my presentation, as you have already noted, is not primarily concerned with the fire district subject that has been discussed earlier, but is more generally on the contract system of government and the metropolitan problem in general.

It has been encouraging to observe the general interest that has been displayed in recent months by representatives of political subdivisions in the metropolitan area on the matter of decreasing the costs of local government. It is also encouraging to many of us representing political subdivisions to see the State, through its legislative committees, expressing an interest in the complexities which confront those of us living in metropolitan areas. It is our sincere hope that we may convey through you to the State Legislature the need for corrective measures which will enable us to meet the challenges of urban living.

The metropolitan complex is unquestionably the most challenging phenomenon existing in our society today. For many years we have watched its growth, and, in our attempts to meet the challenge with partial enactments, we have served only to compound the problem. We are told that in Los Angeles County alone there are some 500 units of government serving the needs and desires of the people who live in and visit the area.

I say that we are told of this number of governmental jurisdictions, as I doubt whether any one of the five and a half million persons living here could list all of these units of government that are serving them. This is not due to apathy or indifference on the part of the people, but is the result of the fractionalization of functions and services in the metropolitan area.

We have in the past attempted to utilize traditional organizational concepts to meet the necessities created by the population growth of our community. This has resulted in compounding the confusion. Although we have been aware of the additional burdens in higher cost of government and inefficiency for the past thirty years, the fact remains that we have increased these costs through the extension of our traditional concept of local government organizations.

There have been, over the several years, numerous programs advocated to cope with the complexities that have arisen in this metropolitan area. In specific instances,

they have been at least partially successful. However, in the main, these proposals have met with failure.

In reviewing a number of these proposals, invariably such goals as economy and efficiency are postulated. In November of 1956, a proposal to amend the State Constitution in an effort to "modernize" the administration of metropolitan government was resoundly defeated by the people at the polls. This defeat appears to have posed an interesting question: Why won't the people in their collective wisdom accept this sort of modification to the organizational structure of their local government? Apparently there was contained in this proposed modification a factor of greater significance than the postulated goals of economy and efficiency. I wish to suggest to this committee that this factor is one of representation.

The very bedrock of our system of government is based upon a concept of representation. As population centers have increased in size and corresponding complexities, the representative system has not met the needs of these areas. Today we find in each State wherein large urban centers are located representation which relegates the urban citizen to a role of "second class citizenship".

A few years ago, this was not a problem--the predominant character of our population was rural. Today it is predominantly urban. Mayor Zeidler of Milwaukee expressed the dilemma, in which we find ourselves, quite poignantly when he observed that "Most state legislatures are apportioned under a predominantly rural

system. Consequently they are rural-minded bodies trying to govern urbanized states". This is not intended to be an affront to the capable members who serve in the legislative bodies of our several urbanized states. It is but to point out the glaring deficiency that exists in the representation of the majority of the citizens of our states. The inability to gain acceptance of reforms in the structure of metropolitan government can, in my opinion, be directly related to this deficiency in representation.

Another factor which has been an obstacle to the development of a metropolitan-oriented government is the lack of integration of constituted public agencies and governing bodies serving the metropolitan area. The organization of county government is a case in point.

Originally, county governments were created as agents of the state; that is, they were to fulfill the duties and responsibilities of the state government at the local level. The creation of the city was not to fulfill the responsibilities of the state but to perform certain public services for concentrated population centers. The development of these two political entities was for separate and distinct purposes. City incorporations and annexations, however, did not expand at the same pace as population expansion. This resulted in some 14 or 15 "unincorporated cities" in Los Angeles County. Such populated unincorporated cities needed public services identical with those of incorporated cities. At this point, Los Angeles County went into municipal service operations on a large scale, furnishing

these services in some instances under contract arrangements, and in other instances, under special district.

These relationships created by Los Angeles County have again compounded the problem by encouraging additional fragmentation of governmental units. As the executive director of the American Municipal Association stated before the 59th Annual Conference of the League of California Cities: "Los Angeles County may well have created a system that could cause problems that would dwarf the ones that brought forth this type of urban county".

Further objections to the activities of the County of Los Angeles in the area of municipal services are these:

1. They fail to produce a government with sufficient comprehensiveness to meet the needs of the metropolitan area.
2. In filling the service gaps through contracts and special districts, it adds to the maize of confusion already existing; and also diffuses the responsiveness of representation.

It is my sincere belief that governments should properly be instituted for the people that are to be served. Too frequently the history of the local and state governmental organizations has been modified only to serve the special political and administrative interests without regard for the people.

Until this injustice in apportionment of representation to metropolitan areas is squarely met and resolved, any effort toward reducing costs and increasing efficiency of governments in metropolitan areas is surely doomed to failure. It is imperative that all of us serving in public office during this

age of contesting ideologies, keep foremost in our minds that only the people are sovereign, and the institutions of government are to be only representative of their will.

This is the text of my report and I want to express my appreciation for being allowed to be here and to speak with you and present this report.

LANTERMAN: Thank you, Mayor Center. I would like to ask you a couple of questions before the committee goes into it. One was your statement relating to the State Legislature, "No state legislatures are apportioned under a predominantly rural system". Now it seems to me I remember reading that in Mayor Dilworth's address to the American Municipal Association and his proposal that because of these things, a metropolitan complex that goes across state lines, we should abandon state government and local government to get some kind of a metropolitan complex that goes straight to Washington for the handout. Now the question is, did you have that in mind when you made this statement?

CENTER: No, I did not.

LANTERMAN: Well, the question arises then, you do not think that the agricultural complexion of the Senate of the State of California is an adequate due balance of power between the predominantly urban Assembly, as the Congress does?

CENTER: This is correct, what you are saying. I believe that what exists in the State of California is unique to this State, more so I mean than to any other state in the Union. We have a state in which the southern portion is

highly populated. For example, in this county alone, or in this area alone, there are some 6 or 7 million people. Those people have lived in a problem which no other state, city or country has experienced. Because of the density of population in this immediate area, and without the multiple dwelling type of structure that New York has, the people in the southern California area have had to spread out over a large area, causing different forms of government to serve each one of these areas, as far as their personal needs were concerned, causing us the problem of freeways, transportation, and court systems. This is a problem that is unique to this area alone, and all I am saying is that the people who must solve this problem are the people who must be most aware of the problem. It requires a representative from the area who is familiar with the problem and the complexity of the problem, to speak their mind and have a full say. I believe that the representation, for example, in the Senate does not allow the Senator from this area sufficient voice in what will happen in the Legislature.

LANTERMAN: In other words, as far as that observation is concerned, you are advocating reapportionment of the State Senate.

CENTER: That's correct.

LANTERMAN: You are in agreement, however, are you not, that the Assembly is an urban house primarily.

CENTER: Yes.

LANTERMAN: It has knowledge of the metropolitan areas, and Los Angeles County is very heavily represented as an area.

CENTER: Very definitely.

LANTERMAN: All of its cities have heavy representation.

CENTER: Very definitely. I feel that a committee such as you have here today, and which you lead, is one of the ways of solving this problem. I feel that by putting forth these facts it will help. I don't think it will make you cognizant of it because I think you probably already are, but I think that I should put forth such facts as this to emphasize the need for representation regarding the area problem because it is so unique.

LANTERMAN: Well, now, I wonder if you have ever studied the borough system of England, and Greater London, and Greater Berlin . . .

CENTER: To some limited extent, yes.

LANTERMAN: And you know that they went overboard in Berlin with the Legislature of about 1100 representatives of all of the communities and urban areas, and so forth, in trying to get adequate representation.

CENTER: I believe that the pendulum can swing as far one way as it can in the other, and it appears that in our local county the pendulum is just about to the extreme the other way. We have five representatives representing a county of approximately six million people. This means that one person is representing in excess of a million people. He can't possibly be a representative of those people in a true light.

LANTERMAN: Any more than the Senator can represent five and a half million people in the State Senate.

CENTER: That is correct.

LANTERMAN: Now, how do we then balance these things with agriculture in the State so much a part of our backbone of economy, with its two and a half billion dollar basis of our State support. Shouldn't they have the protection in at least one House of the Legislature to balance the predominantly urban vote of the Assembly?

CENTER: Mr. Lanterman, I realize that this problem is so complex that I don't have the answers, and don't pretend to, but I am stating in my report that I don't think we will resolve those answers either until we also resolve the problem of representation.

LANTERMAN: You do agree then with this committee's attempt to get the facts of all facets of the problem - fire was just one and your county contract system is another. The fact that newly incorporated cities could have this means to meet the municipal type service and spring full fledged into a city, which it couldn't do otherwise, at the time is a means to an end.

CENTER: Yes, I agree with you, but the only way that this problem can be solved is through such acts as you are taking here today; and I think personally that these individual problems that come up, such as the fire districts, are in fact relating back directly to this whole overall and general problem. They are each one a part of the whole, and your committee in investigating each of these problems, will then be in a position to help solve the whole problem which is a problem made up of these separate factors.

LANTERMAN: In the metropolitan area of the five Bay cities - your own, Torrance, Manhattan, Hermosa, and El Segundo - you made some informal explorations as to problems of mutual interest down there, but you came up with no conclusions as a five-city group?

CENTER: Not as yet.

LANTERMAN: Are you in the process of trying to bring that to some kind of fulfillment - some kind of a localized adopted policy?

CENTER: Yes, we are. Whether it will result in a consolidation of cities, or in a consolidation of functions between the cities, or just in a more firm mutual aid, or agreement between the cities as to the use of each city's functions, with a resultant reduction in costs, I don't know. I only speak for myself. But we have put this out and the people are presently thinking about it and are circulating petitions to bring up study groups in the area in this regard. What the exact end will be, I don't know.

LANTERMAN: Perhaps the same end that this committee is aiming for, merely to bring up facts for people to study, and if we can solve some of these questions of extremes from one side to the other, we will perhaps have a common meeting ground by which we might be able to save some taxes.

CENTER: I certainly hope so.

LANTERMAN: Do any members of the committee have any questions?

JOHNSON: I would like to ask one. Mr. Mayor, do you and your people down through the Redondo area feel that the laws

which you have at the present time for functional consolidation are adequate, or do you think we should have additional legislation?

CENTER: Well, let me say it this way, if I may. Permissive legislation can be, although beneficial, also equally dangerous, and I feel that whenever we are speaking of permissive legislation, we must not only keep in mind those particular things we are attempting to consolidate, or attempting to accomplish by the legislation, such as unity of function, and so forth, but we must also keep in mind the dangers from such permissive legislation, such as a larger body through the use of that permissive legislation being able to crush this smaller unit of government. I think that both sides of this problem must be weighed, and I think the legislative bodies in the State should weigh these before they take action. I personally would not want to make recommendations as to what should be and what shouldn't be added. I would only like to say that we need help, but at the same time that we need help to this end, we want to caution the legislative body of the dangers that are involved and make sure that they are also included in the study.

JOHNSON: Thank you.

BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a question? Mr. Center, what would be your opinion, as expressed to this committee for the record, relative to the proposition of consolidation of cities? Do you feel that the smaller unit of government, for instance, can operate more economically, or do you feel that

there can be economies effected if you consolidate, as I understand the possibility of five small cities in your area?

CENTER: I believe that consolidation of cities can be beneficial to the general taxpayer because he receives a greater service at a less cost, but only as long as that consolidation into one government does not become so large that it passes the point of diminishing return. Now what is that point of diminishing return? I am not an expert and cannot say, but I think this is a point which must be discovered before consolidation can ultimately be discussed with any intelligence, so far as the county and the cities of the County of Los Angeles are concerned. At the present time I feel that when you get over 500,000 you are running into a problem area because the machine of government becomes so large that the person living in that area does not have the proper representation; also, that government becomes so large that it is costly to get into action. Now I may be completely wrong, since it is only a limited study that I have made, and I am sure it won't cover nearly the ground that you will study. However, at the moment it is my belief that about 500,000 seems to be the maximum for the Utopia type of government in which the people in the area governed will receive a maximum amount of representation, and also at the same time, receive the economy of government that they want and the services that they are entitled to.

BRADLEY: Well, Santa Clara County where I come from has a population of 550,000, both in the county area and in the

cities of the county. There are many leaders in my area who feel that we have as many complex metropolitan problems for an area with that population, in proportion to size, as you people have down here in Los Angeles County with ten times the population. So, I am just wondering, for the record, if there is such a thing as this Utopia number that is involved here. We don't seem to be able to put our finger on just exactly what it is, and whether it is directly related to population even seems to be a factor of some doubt.

CENTER: I don't think population is the only factor to be considered, but I think area is also, as you mentioned in Santa Clara County, a factor. Regarding your statement as to the problems in your particular area, and the proportionate number thereof, I think probably in number you are correct. I certainly don't know, but I think that the problem itself becomes more complex because of the increased population. As an example, let me refer to our street and highway problem in Los Angeles County. I believe there are more cars that pass over the freeway system at the intersections down here in one day than there are in the total of nine other states. This gives an example of the complexity of the problem of transportation in this particular area, which I am sure no other city has to this degree. They have the same problem, but not to the same degree.

BRADLEY: Still it is all more or less relative, isn't it, because you could take a comparatively isolated intersection of Los Angeles County here - just the intersection of two roads

of two lanes each - and by virtue of a manufacturing plant suddenly moving into the area, you could have as great a complexity of traffic problems on that relatively obscure corner as you have in your downtown section here on your tremendous freeway.

CENTER: I think there would be no question about the relativity. I think that all the problems of life are relative.

BRADLEY: This committee, of course, on the general subject of municipal and county government, does intend, after this budget session, in addition to this functional consolidation study which we have been pursuing for a number of years because of its growing importance at the local government level, to start a study relative to the tremendous number of new cities which have been incorporated. We want to see if we can chart what the trend will be in regard to these communities, whether they will tend to survive and grow as independent cities, or whether there will be a tendency toward consolidation - or even disincorporation. Your mention of the fact that there are five communities in this area which are making a study of that is of considerable interest to this committee. Quite possibly we would like to include this area as part of our overall study when we come back and get into this particular problem.

CENTER: You see in the particular area which I am from the problem of the taxpayer and the citizen of that area, whether he is in one or another of the five cities mentioned, is pretty common. The people in that area live in one city, work in another, play in another, and travel through all the cities; so

the problem in that particular area, no matter what the problem is that a particular person is referring to, is a common problem to the whole area. This is not necessarily true in a county, for example, the size of Los Angeles, where the weather conditions even are different in the different areas of the county. The problems of the citizens of one part of the County of Los Angeles are not the same as the problems of another portion of Los Angeles, I don't believe.

BRADLEY: Now, do any of these five cities you are interested in contract with the County of Los Angeles for services?

CENTER: I believe all of them contract with the County of Los Angeles to a varying degree for services. I believe the city of Redondo Beach, of which I am Mayor, has approximately nine contracts with the county for different services. None of these cities, however, contract with the County of Los Angeles for these services which I may refer to as basic home services, such as police and fire.

BRADLEY: Well, would you care to express to this committee your personal point of view as to what objection there would be to a city contracting with the county for fire protection, for example, as compared to your not having any objection to a city contracting for health services?

CENTER: Yes, I believe that there are certain services that are predominantly metropolitan in nature, or "regional" is a better word to put on it, such as health service. There are certain services which the county must provide as an agent of

of the State, and for which reason the county was in fact probably created in the beginning. There are other more personal services, such as police and fire, for which the municipality was created and formed for the people, and which is the reason why the people formed such an incorporated area. I think the nature of the service itself has some inference on what services should be contracted for and which should not be contracted for. Basically I have no argument with contract services as long as the person who is receiving the contract service, or the city that is receiving the contract service, is not, as Mr. Hahn put it this morning, getting a free ride. The instance which Mr. Hahn, County Supervisor Hahn, gave this morning regarding the fire district problem and the rubber company in Southgate, I believe, was the exact problem which the metropolitan area has regarding contract services. This morning Mr. Hahn objected to the rubber company contracting with the city for fire services because he thought it should be a part of the county fire district. Now this is the exact theory that I am using; I think that the same philosophy he expounded this morning, in regard to the contract with the city for fire services, will attach to the services that the cities contract to the different counties for. It is probably just a reverse situation.

BRADLEY: But theoretically, applying that same principle, aren't you running into difficulty when you talk about consolidating your five cities.

CENTER: No, I don't see the connection.

LANTERMAN: How do you segregate that? That is of interest to me. How do you segregate the inter-city relationship from a county service that could apply across the five cities?

CENTER: The city was formed, and the principle of the formation of an incorporated city is so the persons and people living within that city will be able to have a direct voice in their government. The county was formed, I believe, to represent the State at a local level. The purpose for the formation of a city was to provide these services to the people at their control and at their direction. The combination of five smaller cities into one larger city will fulfill and further the purpose for which the original cities were incorporated, and does not abuse the principle in any way; but I believe that the changing of the purpose for which the county was originally created, to provide services which were intended to be provided by the city, is an abuse of the principle, because it is then allowing the county to take on a different attitude, or a different complexion from that for which it was created.

LANTERMAN: May I ask this question then, Mr. Bradley? Relating to your supposition, Mayor Center, that there is a fixed formula for certain services to be related to an individual type of local government; in other words, only certain things which are of a metropolitan nature, let us say, should be done by the county, and only certain things which are of municipal and local nature should be then primarily restricted to city responsibility,

isn't your representation, Mayor, primarily one of tax dollar control by your local agency of government? Isn't that the prime interest of your people?

CENTER: No, and that's why I emphasized in my report that I believe the solution to this problem is one of representation. The people in my area, and I believe in all other areas, are of course interested in the amount of tax that they pay; but their greatest interest of all is in the representation that they have in their government, because through that representation they can control some of the great amount of tax that they pay. My concern here is that the people have the proper representation in the government which is going to control them and levy the tax upon them. In a city, as I mentioned, I believe that their relationship to the government is much closer. They can get to and talk with and discuss with the members of their government much easier. They therefore have a much more direct influence on what happens in their particular locality and what charges they will be confronted with for services, and what services they will receive, than if the county is the one that is controlling it.

LANTERMAN: Well now, let's segregate this down, just as a matter of theory, as to local control - local representation. If the five cities of the Bay area - and Manhattan has informed us they are not interested in anything of the kind at the present time, and their city council has taken no action, and therefore it is all informal discussion - if these five

city councils should come up jointly with a solution that they could provide a collective service, and each city would pay its prorated share, each council would then allocate the cost to their local jurisdiction of this major service which they are securing together. Wouldn't the area of representation be just as good if the city council contracted with the county on a wholesale basis to provide that service, providing they have the control on the optional basis of whether the service shall be rendered or whether they shall discontinue the service.

CENTER: In answer to your question, I believe so.

LANTERMAN: The representation is different?

CENTER: Let me first clarify one inference which I may have unintentionally left with you. You mention the position of the city of Manhattan Beach, and that could as well apply to Torrance and the other cities involved because there has been no official consolidation action by any of those cities, as such.

LANTERMAN: Just informal discussions.

CENTER: Yes, and then principally among the people of that area . . .

LANTERMAN: The taxpayers?

CENTER: The taxpayers and the citizens who have displayed an interest in this through petitions, and so forth, which number, I'll tell you at this point, several thousands in the different cities; but at this time there has been no action by my city, as a city government, nor any of the other cities, other than just informal discussions.

LANTERMAN: I didn't mean that to be a criticism; I just wanted to clarify that there had been no official action taken. All right, now to get back to the point I questioned. Does it make any difference whether your one city by its council's action shall decide to contract for a service, regardless of whether it is health, fire, police, or whatever it might be, if they make the choice and set the standard at which they are willing to contract for that service? Isn't the representation the same as though five cities by their joint councilmanic action should determine the same thing out of their collective service?

CENTER: The difference is this. If the five cities will provide the service, their chief will be there locally - if it happened to be the fire department or the police department. Whatever the service is, it will be local in nature; it will be there where the people, if they have an objection to the type of service they get, can make that objection.

LANTERMAN: Well, don't you think that if you are going to consolidate any service, you are going to have to consolidate some chiefs?

CENTER: Very definitely.

LANTERMAN: The administrative level of cost is the one thing that we do know might be saved. The rest of these things are conjecture - we don't know that.

CENTER: The administrative level of cost is the thing that we think we can reduce, as far as cost is concerned,

and the increase in service we think we can gain because it will be a more common unity toward a common goal.

LANTERMAN: In other words, if that is brought about, then you have four less chiefs to deal with locally. You will only have one chief, so four of the cities are going to have less chief representation than they would have had if they each had their own five levels. So, again, we get to the point

CENTER: But the point that you are missing all along is the point that these five cities are so well located in area that their problems are common throughout the five cities. Any one of the chiefs who is presently there is now working on the same problem that any of the other four chiefs are working on. I don't believe that is true in the County of Los Angeles because the terrain is different - the weather is even different in the different areas.

lanterman; How do you separate that on your health situation there?

CENTER: I don't. In all of the health situations, I think the County should provide it.

LANTERMAN: Well, now of course you know that there has been very serious discussion before the Legislature - we even had the bill before us last time but it was not in conformance with the thing we were trying to accomplish - and that was that three of the major cities of Los Angeles County were primarily interested in having an inside and outside rate for health. They did not consider it primarily a county matter.

They considered that if they wished to have their own health department they were entitled to do so, but not have to continue to pay into the county general fund in support of the health services of the cities of Redondo, Torrance, and the rest of the forty some odd cities which do contract with the County for health services. Now the only point I wish to make by relating this is that it depends upon which viewpoint you take as to what service you consider appropriate for the county to render, either out of the general fund or, as a matter of policy say, by district, by contract, or however it's rendered. It's a matter of opinion, and it's only by the exchange of such information as you are bringing to us that we can sort of get focused on this problem.

CENTER: Very definitely. I had in no way intended to propose a solution to this problem because I don't feel that any one person is capable of even comprehending the complexity of the problem in the County of Los Angeles.

Lanterman: Does your city, as a policy, contain all charges such as civil service, fire liability insurance, retirement costs, capital outlay, workmen's compensation, and so on - all of these related charges to a service - do you contain all those in just one block within your budget for all city services or do you apportion the costs to each service in order to get a relative value on that service?

CENTER: We apportion all the costs to the department involved so that our budget reflects their actual cost, but we

do not set up a special fund for that. We charge to the department, as an example, for automobiles, on a rental base so that that department is charged with their actual cost for a year.

LANTERMAN: You do that on all civil service personnel costs, retirement, and so on?

CENTER: Yes, on retirement, for that one department.

LANTERMAN: For that one department.

CENTER: For that one department. Whether it is police, fire, or whatever it is.

LANTERMAN: Would it be possible for you to see that the committee has a copy of the city of Redondo's budget for the coming year, with the indications in it as to where you have allocated these costs?

CENTER: Certainly.

LANTERMAN: We would appreciate that very much. Thank you, Mayor, very much for your presentation.

CENTER: Thank you.

LANTERMAN: Is Chief Miller here? We will now get back to the business at hand which is fire, and continue where we interrupted this morning in order to accommodate the Mayor. As you will well understand, it is very difficult for the committee to keep everybody in a schedule so that it will be convenient for them to appear. Will you identify yourself for the purpose of the record, Chief, and proceed with your presentation?

WILLIAM L. MILLER, Chief Engineer, Los Angeles City Fire Department: My name is William L. Miller and I am the

Chief Engineer for the Los Angeles City Fire Department.

I have been asked to make a presentation here, and also to make a presentation for the California Fire Chiefs' Association. I am not fully aware of every fire chief's attitude throughout the State, but the presentation which I have to make has been approved by the president of the organization, Chief Becker of Monrovia, which is in Los Angeles County.

LANTERMAN: Is Mr. Becker going to make a presentation or are you making it for him?

MILLER: I don't believe he is going to. He addressed a communication to Mr. Farrell and stated that I would.

LANTERMAN: Thank you very much.

MILLER: Mr. Chairman and members of the committee, it is my understanding that we were to consider Assembly Interim Committee Report No. 6, Vol. 6, "Special Report on Fire Service in Los Angeles County" submitted to the subcommittee by the Federated Fire Fighters of California and published by the Assembly of the State of California, and related subjects.

It is assumed that the related subjects are to deal with the consolidation of several fire departments into one large department. Considerable thought and study has been given to this subject by organizations and groups during the past few years. Some people have expressed publicly an opinion regarding the great benefits to be derived by such a merger within this service.

This report under consideration is the result of a study by a group of people who have more than an ordinary interest in the fireservice. This report falls within the same category as several reports which have been rendered in the past. Inasmuch as none of the previous reports have completely explored the entire effect of such a merger or consolidation of fire departments, this report has not gathered all of the facts either.

Such factual material as is presented in this report is mostly correct. However, there are errors and omissions. Statements are made and assumptions are taken in this report which are matters of decision and opinion and could be debated most vociferously.

I might sum the above up by saying that several people have made statements but no group or no person has made a complete enough study from which a sound decision might be made.

If the people in this metropolitan area or within the limits of the County of Los Angeles are interested in consolidating the fire services sufficiently, they will appropriate adequate funds and contract the services of competent people to make a complete study of all of the facets and facts regarding such a large merger as this would be. Until such a study is made, it is presumptuous and probably foolhardy for anyone to jump to conclusions that consolidation might be good or might be bad.

There exists at the present time the Los Angeles County Fire Department which is a large organization and a

competent department. Also there exists laws on the books which permit any city or community who so desires to join the existing County Fire Protection Districts. If the people in any of these communities are interested in becoming a part of a larger fire department, they have but to take advantage of the existing laws. Several cities within Los Angeles County have done just this.

It is my recommendation that those communities and cities who desire to become a part of a large fire department join one of the existing fire protection districts and accomplish this.

It is my further recommendation that until such time as a complete, adequate and thorough investigation and study is made of all of the effects of an overall merger of the fire departments within the County, that people refrain from jumping to conclusions and making statements as to the vast amounts of money which will be saved and as to the great improvement in the fire service.

LANTERMAN: Thank you, Chief. Now, may I ask a couple of questions relating to the general statement that you just made? Have you had an opportunity to go through the report and find out its weaknesses, or its invalidities, other than the general comments that you have made? Have you specific recommendations as to some of the contents of the report?

MILLER: I have been through the report two or three times and I frankly don't have time to study every report of this

kind that comes along. I have been through it enough to find some errors; I have been through it enough to find assumptions that are taken that might be debatable; and I've been through it enough to find omissions. That's why I make the statement that this report, which we were asked to discuss, falls into the same category as several others. It is not complete; it is not thorough; it is not adequate; it does not cover the entire field which needs to be covered to base a sound decision.

LANTERMAN: Would it be possible for you, or your technical staff, to favor the committee with some specific commentaries upon the contents of the report. Of course the report was not published for the purpose of advocacy by the committee, but was published to put the material before us for discussion.

MILLER: I understand that.

LANTERMAN: And would it be possible for your department to find the time to give us the benefit of your thinking, along with some of the other chiefs, to give us a critical analysis of the report, perhaps not in detail but as to outstanding areas of disagreement or criticism?

MILLER: I would be willing to go through the report and sort out the errors, sort out the omissions, and sort out the points where assumptions are made that are based probably because of someone's prejudgment, or desire. I am not going to go through this report and rip it apart, line by line. As you probably know, this is a subject that could - I don't say that it is - but it could become quite controversial within the

fire service itself to promote such a controversy. It would be very damaging to the fire service in this county and the people would probably suffer as the result of it because of low morale and the damage that controversy might do.

LANTERMAN: We don't want any commentary to create controversy. All we would like to have are some of the glaring omissions, inaccuracies, or improper conclusions which you might, from a critical analysis, say, in my experience, on behalf of the fire service and the fire chiefs, we would like to point out to the committee some of the following observations, without having any personalities, and give us the benefit of your conclusions. Could that be done?

MILLER: I will try.

LANTERMAN: We would appreciate it.

JOHNSON: Mr. Lanterman, I was just wondering if the Chief could get for us, through the Chiefs' organization throughout the State, some of their views; in other words, we are not only interested in the County of Los Angeles, but up and down the State. I was wondering whether it would be proper for a committee of your organization, Chief, to take this under advisement and submit your points for and against this particular kind of legislation, and submit that to the committee?

MILLER: I will be very happy to submit it to them for the consideration of their body. I can't speak as to whether they would do that; but I will be very happy to submit it to them for their consideration.

JOHNSON: I think that would be as much help to the committee as anything I know of on this type of legislation. Then you would be getting at least an overall picture of the State.

MILLER: Thank you, Mr. Lanterman.

LANTERMAN: Are there any other questions from members of the committee? Thank you, Chief, very much for your presentation. We would appreciate being able to, not tear the report apart - that wasn't the purpose - but to point out perhaps some of the things that should guide the committee in its analysis of what we have before us today and what has been presented prior to this time. Thank you very much.

Is Mel Horton, Research Director of the Property Owners' Association here? Will you come forward, please? Do you have your presentation in written form?

MELVIN HORTON, Research Director, Property Owners' Tax Association: Yes, I do have and I will have additional copies for the members of the committee.

To taxpayers, the map of Los Angeles County, with its crazy-quilt pattern of cities shooting out odd-shaped appendages, means just one thing: wasteful government.

On many occasions this Association has urged our civic and political leaders to take thought of developing some plan of metropolitan government to meet the needs created by our growth - needs now partly met by costly multiplication of units of government resulting in duplication and overlapping of services.

One means of improving these conditions is the establishment of areawide districts to perform a single function of the many required to serve an urban population. In Los Angeles County we have for many years enjoyed successful operation of areawide tax assessing, flood control and storm drain facilities, and sewage disposal systems - although the last is still divided in two major systems. This Association is convinced that taxpayers would benefit substantially from extension of unified operations to other functions of government. Among these is fire service which you have under consideration today.

The report on this subject made to this committee by the Federated Fire Fighters of California is a most comprehensive basis for supporting the development of a countywide fire service. The salient features of the case for unifying our fire protection forces, as we of the Property Owners Tax Association of California see them, can be very simply stated.

In the metropolitan area of Los Angeles county some 46 different fire departments are in operation. Two of these - the Los Angeles city and the county departments - are as large as all the rest combined. Three-fourths of the total number operate only from one to three fire stations. Their very smallness limits their capabilities so that major fires or simultaneous fires within a small city may result in much heavier losses than if a larger organization were available in the area.

Taxpayers of the Los Angeles metropolitan area pay in excess of \$50,000,000 annually for fire protection services, an

amount sufficient in total - according to most experts in the field - to provide high quality service in every part of this huge community. And yet only the city of Los Angeles fire department is rated by the National Board of Fire Underwriters as a Class One department - the highest rating granted and the most favorable as affecting fire insurance rates.

The very irregular shape of some cities adds to the difficulties of maintaining good fire protection service. The Los Angeles metropolitan area is criss-crossed with the boundary lines of about 60 cities and many unincorporated communities. In many cases engine companies are responding to fires one or two miles distant from their stations while just across the district border, within a few blocks of the fire, the engine company of an adjoining city stands idle. Actually, it is not uncommon even for the fire equipment of one city to pass the door of a fire station in another city or district on its way to reach a far corner of its jurisdiction - an obvious waste of valuable emergency time, as well as of the taxpayer's dollar.

Because of legal and other difficulties, fire fighting equipment and men do not cross boundary lines to fires outside their jurisdiction except in case of special emergency. Precious time is always lost before engine companies can be brought from one city or county jurisdiction to another under a mutual aid agreement. As a result, losses of property and sometimes of lives occur which would be prevented if a single, countywide fire protection organization were established. It is small

wonder that only the stations in a particular city can be counted on as fire protection for that city by the National Board of Fire Underwriters.

One of the most costly results to taxpayers of this condition is that cities, in order to obtain the best fire insurance rates, locate many fire stations close to each other across a common boundary. This wasteful practice of over-coverage in some areas is matched by a lack of coverage in others that can also be costly. Existing within our county are countless shoestring strips of land, islands, or just plain oddly shaped cities that cannot be protected adequately owing to the great financial burden it would place on the taxpayer.

These are by no means the end of the difficulties and costs resulting solely from the large number and odd shape of our fire districts. All too often, persons in border areas giving a fire alarm by telephone will call the wrong department, and time is lost before they are referred and switched over to the department covering the area of the fire. But even these occurrences are of minor importance compared to the needless difficulties now imposed on our fire fighting resources in combatting conflagrations, such as the Malibu fire of recent years or a forest fire in our foothills. While men and equipment are marshalled from all over the county and beyond, under such conditions they cannot now function together nearly so well as they would if they belonged to a single metropolitan fire protection force.

In the matter of communications alone, numerous frequencies and radio systems are employed by the various fire departments. Training is not uniform, an obstacle to efficient coordination of men working side by side. A variety of equipment is used, making it difficult for officers in charge of battling conflagration to assign it to particular spots with full knowledge of its capabilities. The best coordination that can be achieved under these conditions falls far short of the efficiency which can be reached by a single, large fire force.

The conclusion is inescapable that we who pay for fire protection would be much better served by a single metropolitan fire department than we are at present. Both by a reduction in fire insurance rates and by the elimination of waste in the creation and operation of fire stations and engine companies, owners of property would be relieved of a substantial part of costs they now bear. That difficulties do exist in bringing about so sensible an establishment - particularly in working out pension arrangements of employees - no one can deny. But the advantage of a unified fire fighting force would be worth a great deal of effort.

LANTERMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Horton. Do you have one of those that you can leave with the Committee?

HORTON: Yes, sir, I filed one previously, and I can leave several.

LANTERMAN: Just hand them to us and we will see that they are distributed. Do any members of the committee wish to question this gentleman?

BRADLEY: Mr. Chairman, may I ask one question?

LANTERMAN: Mr. Horton, would you respond?

BRADLEY: Mr. Horton, has your taxpayers association in this area generally taken any stand in regard to consolidation of cities, such as the discussion that is going on in these five Bay Area cities, on the grounds of economy, as well as any other grounds?

HORTON: No, we have not. What we have done is to advocate on several occasions in recent years that a thoroughgoing examination be made of the problems in this area dealing with these conflicts of the smaller units of government, and that we begin to work toward the formulation of a genuine metropolitan government for this area, with due protection for the local and individual community characteristics.

BRADLEY: Do you feel that in that respect there are some possible grounds for discussion as to, for example, the number of supervisors that you have for a county of this size, being as it is at the present time five. Do you think there should be greater representation?

HORTON: Yes, we do.

BRADLEY: Do you feel that if a step were taken along that line that it might generally have some effect perhaps to allay objections by communities of the insufficient representation that they have at the present time and might be encouraging to consolidation?

HORTON: Well, it might be, but we don't know that county government as it is now established would be the government

that would finally become the metropolitan government of Los Angeles; although, in any such problem, you are going to use the materials that you have at hand.

LANTERMAN: I agree that that wouldn't necessarily follow, but do you feel that in general there has been enough expressions of opinion that you people are aware of that the question of representation, even on the existing county level of government, is a factor in the minds of people?

HORTON: We think it is definitely a factor. Representation can be improved in county government, however, but there are limitations at the other end, we believe, in getting a body that's too cumbersome to act. There must be a happy medium somewhere but we do not think that representation has kept pace with the growth of the county.

BRADLEY: Now, getting down to this particular matter of fire service, has your organization made any specific study as to what you believe would be the savings, dollar-wise, if you had a countywide fire service?

HORTON: We have looked at it enough to know that with our resources and facilities, we could not begin to come up with any real idea of what the financing of a single fire department for the entire area would mean financially to the taxpayers, except that we are convinced that in these particular instances, we can spot these inefficiencies that now exist. We feel, for example, that the Los Angeles City Fire Department has achieved a pretty high level of efficiency. I think that has

been demonstrated by their record. We think that a single large fire department can do a much better job in a given area, particularly when they must cover areas so peculiarly outlined and bordered as the city and county areas of this metropolitan area as a whole.

BRADLEY: Have you given any thought, or have you made any study as to what the problems might be if you, for example, eliminate the City of Los Angeles Fire Department from the countywide fire service, as to the possibilities of additional cost, by reason of the fact that it would be as large as it would be, or do you feel that these studies that you have made indicate that there would be a problem involved there of a countywide service, exclusive of the City of Los Angeles, to keep down the costs of two large departments?

HORTON: I think the costs can be kept in line, and what would undoubtedly happen would be that you would have approximately the same amount of money spent on fire protection services, with a great improvement in those services in many areas.

BRADLEY: Do you think that the present 63 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation would be reduced if you had a countywide service exclusive of the city of Los Angeles, based upon a broader tax base?

HORTON: Yes, I think that would occur.

BRADLEY: Do you have any idea what that figure would be?

HORTON: No, I think it would be impossible to calculate.

BRADLEY: Do you think that if the countywide service included the city of Los Angeles, with its assessed valuation,

that it would be even lower than the sum total of the assessed valuation of the county outside of the city of Los Angeles? Would it follow that the broader the tax base, the lower the cost of operation per \$100 of assessed valuation?

HORTON: Well, you can't always tell because of the level of services. It's not going to be the same in the sparsely settled area as it is going to be in a congested area, of course. There is probably a pretty close relationship between the level of assessed valuation, in even a small area, and the level of fire services that are called for there - although that is not always true, particularly as compared with a run-down area to a well built area. The run-down ones require more service relative to their assessed valuation than others.

BRADLEY: Do you think that if there was a countywide fire service that there would be any savings in fire insurance rates by giving higher classification for areas of the county which now have a lower classification?

HORTON: There surely could be if the service was operated as well as either the county service now, or supposing the higher level of service is the one that the city operates.

BRADLEY: Is the classification which the Fire Underwriters give the present existing county fire service a Class 2 rating generally, or is that variable with sections of the County?

HORTON: I think that varies to some degree. I would suggest getting that information from the Fire Underwriters, because I don't have that spotted.

BRADLEY: I think that's all.

LANTERMAN: Thank you very much. We appreciate your presentation.

Is the Chief Engineer of the Fire Underwriters' Board, John Colton, present? Would you be willing to answer some questions, Mr. Colton, please?

JOHNSON: I might say that Mr. Colton never received his request to attend.

LANTERMAN: Well, he may not be able to present all of the facts we want, but if he doesn't, maybe we can get them later. Will you identify yourself please for the record?

JOHN COLTON, District Engineer, Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific: I am John Colton, District Engineer for the Board of Fire Underwriters of the Pacific, in charge of the office that handles the southern California area of our organization.

LANTERMAN: Mr. Colton, according to your letter, you indicated that there was no need for you to prepare a presentation; that was not your function.

COLTON: I couldn't say that there was no need, but I would hesitate to embark upon something like that for which I am so poorly fitted.

LANTERMAN: Well, now, let's just argue with you there a little bit as to whether you are fitted or not. In any event, the question I would like to ask is what happens in a situation like Downey, for instance, as to the level of service that had been rendered by the county under the Consolidated Fire

District? What was their classification prior to their withdrawing from the district, do you recall?

COLTON: The overall classification under the National Board grading schedule for the city of Downey was a Class 4. That is not the fire department classification, but the average, or level, of all the factors that make up the gradable fire defense system; including a water supplying factor that is at least as of great importance in this grading classification as the fire department, and the fire alarm facilities, building laws and their enforcement, fire prevention laws and their enforcement, and actual structural conditions.

LANTERMAN: Well now, that was Class 4.

COLTON: Yes, that was Class 4.

LANTERMAN: What happened as the result of the withdrawal from the Consolidated Fire District as to their grading?

COLTON: Nothing has happened as far as the official grading is concerned, because these gradings cannot be kept up from day to day, or with every change. The making of the grading involves a considerable amount of study and work. However, there was some concern about the possibility of deterioration of the fire protection to the possible danger of the insurance company liabilities in that area. We checked with the city and determined what their general plan was, and we ran an estimate as closely as we could on the basis of the factors of the old official grading, and with whatever up-to-date information we could get. There seemed to be a reasonable chance that the

city's plan was sufficiently comprehensive that it would come very close to maintaining its overall Class 4, and certainly their complete plan, which they expected to go ahead with continuously, would produce that effect.

LANTERMAN: How long does it usually take under the grading plan, or are these factors taken into consideration, before a city comes full fledged into a new organizational structure for their fire department? How long do you consider is a reasonable factor of time before they can qualify with properly integrated, trained personnel to operate the fire department? Is there a period of time that you usually give?

COLTON: Nothing set.

LANTERMAN: Nothing set at all?

COLTON: It's a matter of judgment, and that is why we went down there immediately before the change was made so that if there was a mistake being made with very serious consequences, we could do our share toward letting the city officials know our opinion.

LANTERMAN: Well, did the standby equipment - some of the ancient material that they had there standing by - did it qualify as equal to the county equipment that they had?

COLTON: No, but that was a temporary condition.

LANTERMAN: In other words, there is a leeway of time interval as to actual condition, and by the time the underwriters get to re-examining the situation, the leeway is in their favor and you ignore the actual situation that may have been the result?

COLTON: Had there been the possibility of reaching

a fairly sound conclusion that the fire defense system would suffer materially in light of the plan that was to be employed, I think that we probably would have done a lot more work on it than we have.

LANTERMAN: A question then arises in my mind. Is part of the consideration the fact that the County Consolidated District was still available on call if there was a major fire?

COLTON: Well, . . .

LANTERMAN: I'm just saying the availability of the material under the . . .

COLTON: Could we say that it wasn't only the County Fire Department that was still available on what we call an outside aid call, but all of the other cities, the adjoining cities, had their fire departments which were quite willing to assist on an outside aid call and in general conformity with the day to day mutual aid plan that has been worked up under the Civil Defense Organization.

LANTERMAN: The question that arose in my mind was whether or not the county stations that were within the area circle of response distance that would be required would have an effect upon your thinking; also the adjacency of city equipment, if there were some.

COLTON: They would have some effect, but not as much as one might draw from your question. The fire service - the insurance people - don't think too highly of the value of protection that is available only after the fire has occurred

and the city that finds it needs aid has to ask for that aid, and then at that late date of the occurrence of the fire, request its response.

LANTERMAN: Of mutual aid?

COLTON: That's correct.

lanterman; Then they ignore the situation of the withdrawal temporarily, and consider the standby equipment sufficient.

COLTON: We ignored nothing so far as I can figure.

LANTERMAN: Well, I mean the difference between what prevailed before and what prevailed after the withdrawal. I am just trying to find out what constitutes the grading schedule, and apparently the time interval can be disregarded. Let's put it that way rather than "ignored". Temporarily, then, it is not of sufficient magnitude to disturb the grading of the city for fire insurance grading?

COLTON: That is correct.

LANTERMAN: All right. Now, in your opinion, would have have any knowledge of the Metropolitan Fire Brigade of Greater London?

COLTON: Very little.

LANTERMAN: Are you familiar with the background of understanding that it is a metropolitan type of service?

COLTON: I do understand that, yes.

LANTERMAN: Would you conclude that during the holocaust of attack and aerial bombing, the metropolitan nature

of that brigade served the community of Greater London with all its boroughs and county councils, county boroughs, and city boroughs, and their metropolitan relationship there - that they had a unified service, unified equipment dispersal, unified metropolitan communications, standards of training, equipment, and so on?

COLTON: Yes, but there is a question in my mind whether it worked to any greater effectiveness than the contemplated operation of the civil defense organization that has been made up in plan with all of the existing fire fighting organizations in areas such as the metropolitan area here and throughout the State.

LANTERMAN: Well, then, metropolitan water, the metropolitan police, and the metropolitan fire, served no special purpose in your thinking in the London experience under these attacks, as a matter of distribution and dispersal of forces, and so on?

COLTON: I would be unable to evaluate that condition. I think it is possible that it might offer more complication in operating a large complex organization than it would with a well coordinated plan, using many small organizations. I'm not qualified to judge on that.

LANTERMAN: Well, the National Board has made no study of that background; they have no knowledge, then, whether it actually served to a good purpose or whether it did not.

COLTON: I believe that the National Board has not made such a study. I can't tell you. Certainly our office has

not, and the Pacific Board has not.

LANTERMAN: Has the National Board ever been requested to make such a study?

COLTON: I think not.

LANTERMAN: What would happen if they were? Would they be interested in such background and gathering that information in relation to fire hazard and fire control?

COLTON: They would have a curiosity concerning it, I believe. I'll tell you where I think perhaps a study of somewhat that nature might have been made, and that is with the National Fire Protection Association, of which the National Board is a participating member.

LANTERMAN: Would it be possible for you to make inquiry as to whether any such information were available through your offices?

COLTON: Of my office?

LANTERMAN: Yes.

COLTON: Well, I can tell you that from my office it is not available, because it doesn't exist.

LANTERMAN: But the National Board - would they make it available to the committee? How could the committee avail itself of this information?

COLTON: If they had it I believe they would give it to you. I think the committee could feel quite free to address the National Board and ask if they have any such thing.

LANTERMAN: Where would they address it?

COLTON: To either their New York office or the San Francisco office. The National Board of Fire Underwriters could be addressed at their San Francisco location.

LANTERMAN: Do you happen to know that, or could you send it to our secretary? Can you get it? All right. We want to get that address so we can get that information. You see there is a lot of conjecture and a lot of estimating based not on specific knowledge but upon estimates. I don't believe that the committee should go into any study on the thing until they know what the result would be.

COLTON: Mr. Lanterman, I would not have too great a hope of finding any comprehensive study made of such a condition as that war time condition of London by the National Board. They have a general related interest to it but not of deep primary interest.

LANTERMAN: They don't anticipate then any kind of national holocaust, or attack . . .?

COLTON: A war time condition is completely different than the condition for which they were originally organized, and for which they function.

LANTERMAN: And they don't understand - I mean they don't anticipate - going into that aspect of hazard?

COLTON: I believe that is generally correct.

LANTERMAN: If a metropolitan fire department could be formed to take the place of the 47 existing fire departments in the county, what would be the extent of change in the various city grades for fire departments?

COLTON: To give a very general question a similarly general answer, the effect probably would be, without knowing the details, to level off, more or less, on a fairly favorable level, the spots where the protection at the present time is not as good. For instance, a small city with a single fire station has been unable to afford more than one or two fire companies, with its water system and limited building department, and its fire prevention work might produce a grading level of Class 7 or 8, out of a possible ten classes, of which 10 is the poorest. If those stations and companies and organizations and general facilities were to be available on a consolidated basis with the adjacent available fire stations, receive the alarms and the assignments, and roll in on the fires according to a pre-planned running card system, it is conceivable that that same community might grade three or four classes better.

LANTERMAN: If we had a consolidated fire department in the metropolitan concept - this is just a supposition, a hypothetical question - if such a department were created and adopted, the grading requirements, the policy, or the policy of operation of the Los Angeles City Fire Department, which of course includes all of the items of buildings, water supply, and so on, would it in your opinion have a major effect upon the cost of fire insurance countywide? In other words, if we could get to be Grade 1 in a metropolitan operated fire department, what would be the impact countywide on the insurance costs?

COLTON: Well, I take it that you mean if the fire department level of service that we now have in the major portions

of the city of Los Angeles were to be set up and established throughout the metropolitan area, the effect would then depend upon the other factors of water supply primarily, and to a lesser extent, the existence of fire alarm systems, and so on. There are an awful lot of very poor water systems in this area, Mr. Lanterman, not to prejudice the good grading of the best fire department.

LANTERMAN: To what percentage does that control it then?

COLTON: That I couldn't tell you.

LANTERMAN: You don't use a factor for water supply on your grading?

COLTON: Well, the factor of water supply is 34 percent of the overall grading consideration.

LANTERMAN: That's what I meant.

COLTON: Yes.

LANTERMAN: In other words, you couldn't give a broad answer then, assuming that without the water supply standards of Los Angeles City in its best places, not, for instance, like you had at the Mt. Washington fire where they had a dead end, sub-standard, sub-grade, fire water supply - only at the highest rating - if that were applied, you just couldn't vision that kind of . . .

COLTON: Well, all I can do is draw comparison with what we are finding in our more up-to-date studies of the county operation. The County Fire Department in its best areas

has built up to a gradable quality in various of the communities to a relative Class 2, compared with the relative Class 1 of the Los Angeles Fire Department. With that classification of fire department, and considering the rather considerable problems of water supply, we are finding that county areas achieve gradings, the best of which at the present time is Class 4, and the poorest of which is running around Class 6 or 7. Now it is quite possible that when we get around to re-inspecting some of the areas where the County Fire Department has been improving and concentrating its efforts, its services, that we might even find Class 3 in there. I hope that will give you the general, comparative, phase of it.

LANTERMAN: Let me get this one question in here, Seth, and then you ask your question. How do you classify, for instance, the area of Mt. Washington? Is that a separate classification from areas adjacent or is it under the blanket?

COLTON: It's blanketed into the general

LANTERMAN: Regardless then of the actual deficit of water supply within that limited area and the hazard that exists, it still comes within the blanket of the general concept of the metropolitan district?

COLTON: That is correct.

JOHNSON: You got my answer.

LANTERMAN: Yes, that is the point I am interested in in my own little community of La Canada, the foothill area, in which a comment was made about some substandard lines of water

supply, you do recommend that these things be changed but you do not go into the city and give them a detailed, specific recommendation for their bad areas, or do you?

COLTON: We try to but it is impossible; for instance, in the city of Los Angeles, it is impossible to single out areas such as the Mt. Washington one and put the finger on that particular problem for the purpose of making recommendations, other than just general ones. The general standards of the National Board of Fire Underwriters, which the National Board uses, and which our office uses, are also used in cities and towns to a considerable extent in making their own planning. If those standards are adhered to over the years, these deficiencies will be absorbed and will disappear. I believe that is the effect of the overall grading classification report by the National Board scheduling system.

LANTERMAN: Well, then you take some of the cities, for instance, like El Monte, Class 7; Gardena, Class 8; Glendora, Class 7; Hermosa Beach, 8; La Verne, 7; Palos Verdes Estates, 8; Pomona, 7; West Covina, 8; these are all then cumulative as to the nature and extent of their equipment, the manpower, the dispersal of their fire stations, and the equipment in them, and the water supply. These are all the things that go to make up the grading. Now, if we were to take, say, and create a regional area, for instance, of West Covina, Covina, Glendora, LaVerne, and the rest of it, and put that area in under a standard, would there be a savings

in the cost of fire insurance by bringing those gradings up, provided they have adequate water, and so on? If you could get your equipment, manpower, and dispersal up to the point where we could make a Grade 2 of the county - like we have for the County Fire Department - wouldn't there be substantial fire insurance grading savings?

COLTON: There probably would be. Certainly the classification could be considerably improved when you consider that you would be tripling or quadrupling the amount of manpower and probably doubling the amount of fire apparatus that would operate out of those fire stations at the cost to the taxpayer. It would cost more to get a better fire department.

LANTERMAN: It would cost more but the total amount saved in insurance - would that be an offset?

COLTON: It would offset but not completely.

LANTERMAN: It would not offset completely.

COLTON: I doubt it.

LANTERMAN: It would mean higher taxes.

COLTON: I believe so.

LANTERMAN: And no offset to justify it.

COLTON: Not a net result of an offset. Generally you don't get your fire protection free in the light of insurance rates.

LANTERMAN: Well, these cities we are speaking of are primarily segregated separate units - some of them not too big - and it would be possible to contemplate then that if there

were an area of similar cities that were in a similar classification, it might be an improvement all the way around if some kind of a consolidated unified service were set up with the improvements to bring the standards up.

COLTON: It is quite possible that there could be an improvement. I believe that the Municipal Year Book's figures of the City Managers' Association reflects the fact that on the basis of a per capita protection comparison, the small city suffers for the same expenditures. In other words, at say \$5.00 per capita cost - we'll just take that as a figure - for a city of 1000 population, that is only \$5,000 per year, and you don't get much fire department for that. For 100,000 population at \$5.00 per capita, which is \$500,000, you can get a pretty good fire department for that same unit cost. So, to that extent, I certainly can agree with several comments that you had from previous testimony that there must be a line of most efficient division.

LANTERMAN: Bigness is not necessarily the most efficient in all instances?

COLTON: I would say not, but smallness . . .

LANTERMAN: . . . is also a handicap.

COLTON: It could be a serious handicap.

LANTERMAN: Then you take the five Bay Area cities, for instance. Torrance is quite sufficient unto itself as to industrial tax base; El Segundo, of course is also - with its Standard Oil tax base, and so on; Hermosa, Redondo and Manhattan have very little in tax base. I mean it is mostly residential.

Would it be possible for the concept of that integration there into a unified type of district for fire, to supply the major equipment on the basis of mutual - not mutual aid - but mutual use and more centralized and better located fire stations, and would they come up with a better rating?

COLTON: There are so many "ifs" involved in answering that. The weaker fire departments in company manpower certainly would have to be leveled off in such a consolidation. Now, would that leveling off be at the expense of the better and stronger companies at the present time, or at the expense of a higher tax level? You see there are those factors in there, Mr. Lanterman, which I think make the question rather involved as to getting a clear cut answer.

LANTERMAN: In other words, a study would have to be made in that five unit area for purposes of re-distribution of equipment in relation to need as to standardized training, as to standardization of equipment, and as to standardization of water supply. They would have to mutualize many of these things then. You would have to be able to talk in terms of apples and apples, not apples and oranges, as to these various levels as supplied by a different city with their different attributes or deficiencies.

COLTON: I believe that's correct.

LANTERMAN: Well, may I ask this question? What was the situation at the Firestone plant as to its insurance rate when it was not a member of the Consolidated Fire District

and had a contract for Southgate to supply fire service? Does it get a rating on its insurance for the city of Southgate, or Southgate plus county, or county alone? How would that be rated for insurance purposes?

COLTON: I have to speak from a recollection of a long time ago because since 1946-47 I haven't had anything to do with insurance rates. Our office was completely separated from the rating bureau under the current state insurance law. I do have long years of experience in that and I can give you a generalized answer. In this case I believe that the insurance rate of each of those plants does not depend to any great extent on the public fire protection picture. They are privately protected by sprinkler systems - rather heavy coverage of sprinkler systems - and when you get good coverage by an effectively designed sprinkler system, the importance of the fire department is much less, as far as the insurance risk factor is concerned. Of course it is not similarly less to the property owner, because while his dependence on the fire department probably is not as great, having that sprinkler system, he nevertheless has to look to the fact that there are conditions where you can have fires at a time when the sprinkler system might break down, and then you sure wish you had a fire department.

LANTERMAN: Would there be an automatic benefit to the plant as to its insurance rating if it were to annex to the city, regardless of the fact that it was adjacent to the city and only had a contract with the city for fire?

COLTON: My impression is that the contract was of such a nature that the rating organization accepted the protection on the same level as though it were part of the city.

LANTERMAN: Was there a benefit then related, by virtue of the contract, upon a city?

COLTON: I think there was, but as I ventured before, I believe that it was relatively small - something like 5 percent; whereas, if this plant itself was an unsprinklered risk, its unprotected rate level would be extremely high. The difference between its unprotected level and the Class 4, I believe, level of Southgate would be a tremendous thing.

LANTERMAN: If the rating on that plant were related to Class 2 Consolidated Fire District Service, would it have been beneficial for the plant to have been annexed to the Consolidated Fire Department, even though it had been on call by mutual aid?

COLTON: Again I am speaking on supposition and my recollection of the sprinklered risk department's schedule of credits and grading methods. They look to not only the class of the city to aid them in determining the credits, but also the actual assignment of companies, manpower, and so forth, as justifying the credit level that they do arrive at. Now, for instance, in some cities of Class 3 level there have been plants maybe of such location in an outlying area where the distance factor from the nearest fire station was of considerable interest to that rating map; and I have seen their

evaluation that instead of the city's Class 3, they considered it the approximate equivalent of Class 5 or Class 6, as far as their rating methods were concerned.

LANTERMAN: I see. Are there any questions by the committee that haven't been answered?

BRADLEY: May I ask this question? Mr. Colton, Mr. Lanterman referred to the five Bay Area cities, and my question would be this: suppose there was an actual consolidation of those five cities into one, and nothing else was done in regard to the fire equipment, total number of manpower - in other words, it just became one city and everything else with regard to those fire departments remained in status quo - would that lead to any change in their classification, either up or down?

COLTON: That would depend upon changes that occur as a result of that. If they were to consolidate, certainly there would be some effect upon the administration of those fire departments and the command, would there not?

BRADLEY: Well, there would be one command instead of five.

COLTON: And with that coordination of the greater manpower with which to operate at individual fires, under the command of a single group of commanding officers, I think you would begin to get some effect there, even though you did not change the nature of the fire station locations or pumper capacity types and sizes, or manpower arrangements. Yes, I believe there would be some effect. Certainly there would be something in the way of unified, and perhaps better training.

LANTERMAN: Well, if there wasn't a uniform change over the total area of the five cities, there might be a spot change, would there not; that is, one city of those five might have had a much lower classification in which you would be almost in a position to say that there would be an immediate improvement in that spot area by virtue of the fact that you now had an addition of four other cities and their equipment.

COLTON: Yes.

NIELSEN: Mr. Chairman, might I just ask a question? Under that circumstance, the rating bureau would set up perhaps five zones, each with a different fire rate, as they have done in many cities in various parts of the cities. All of the city doesn't have the identical rate for dwellings or industrial buildings; they may lower the rate somewhat because of the better supervision but they could establish five different rates for the one consolidated city.

COLTON: They certainly could.

NIELSEN: And they do that.

COLTON: Where there is any wide difference of an individual, fairly well defined area from the levels of the overall, yes.

NIELSEN: You see, we annex to cities and take in sparsely settled areas where there are no fire departments, and while it is a part of the city, nevertheless, that takes a higher rating for fire insurance purposes; and until such time as the city's equipment is extended out there, there is no re-rating, and so those rates stay the same until improvements are made.

COLTON: That's correct, and it is quite possible in this simple consolidation that you spoke of, Mr. Bradley, that you could get together and study how you could best use the combined facilities. For instance, in the first alarm assignment, instead of the usual two companies that would respond to a fire, perhaps you could respond with three or four companies and effectively use the greater manpower on that first alarm response. There would be some effect from that sort of thing, yes.

BRADLEY: Well, in other words, if the five cities did consolidate, the Fire Underwriters Association would be interested in going in to make a study to determine the possibility of a better classification.

COLTON: Definitely.

BRADLEY: And that possibility could come about within a reasonable period of time.

COLTON: That's correct.

BRADLEY: If it was justified.

COLTON: Yes.

JOHNSON: Mr. Colton, I just wonder if the Underwriters of the Pacific, or even the National Underwriters, has any policy relative to these consolidations over that of the small individual charter city. In other words, do they have any particular stand; do they encourage such a thing?

COLTON: They don't have any policy. They try not to enter into the choice of the individual taxpayer or group

of taxpayers. They try to confine themselves officially to evaluating what the taxpayer says, such as, "Well, I have this now; what's it worth in fire insurance credits?" They try to evaluate that, and then too, through their generalized recommendations, to point out the weak spots for their plan, but there is no effort to influence what a community has felt that it ought to do. If there are some very sore spots in there where the insurance companies might suffer badly in a considerable area, or something like that, to the extent that the overall rate level of the area being studied should be raised, that's different. It gives the city a chance either of considering the corrections that are necessary to maintain the level or else accepting a higher level; but that's about the only case where there is any pressure brought to bear on a community.

JOHNSON: All right, now then, I've forgotten these but I did know them once - on the rates, for instance, 34 points are for water. Offhand, do you have the other points for rating?

COLTON: Yes, I think I remember them. It is 34 percent, or 3400 points, for water, 3200 for fire department, 550 for fire alarm, 200 for building laws and their enforcement, 300 for fire prevention laws and their enforcement, 700 for structural conditions, and 50 for police, making up a total of 5000 possible deficiency points to make a tenth class.

JOHNSON: I thought that might be interesting to the committee.

LANTERMAN: Mayor Peavey said this morning, Mr. Colton, that before the city of Downey incorporated, there

was only one fire station within the boundaries of what is now the city to bring about the Class 2 grade of the fire department serving that city - or was the grade based on the surrounding eight stations - the Class 2?

COLTON: The grading of that so-called Downey area of the county was not exactly the same as the Downey city limits, and that grading level was dependent upon its position in a battalion area of the county, where I believe there were 12 or 13 stations, and there was a running card assignment of 4 engine companies to all industrial and commercial first alarm fires within the city. They had to travel somewhat farther than will be the case under the present city plan of building new stations within the city area, but the strength was greater - the manpower strength - when it did arrive, than the present strength is.

LANTERMAN: Well, then, with the present strength, do they still retain Grade 2 for the fire department?

COLTON: That Grade 2 will officially apply until a new survey and a careful analysis of the city is completed. My own estimate of the new fire department organization was within Class 3 instead of Class 2 - relative class for the fire department.

LANTERMAN: Then the classification that the Mayor gave us that what the county gave them for \$400,000 - no, for \$600,000 - certainly didn't rate with what they are now getting for \$400,000, would hardly add up - as to manpower, equipment and service.

COLTON: I am afraid that I will be forced into controversy with Mayor Peavey, which I have no desire to do - I've done that before!

LANTERMAN: Well, we don't want a controversy, but I was just wondering if there was an inaccuracy there.

COLTON: The point is that whatever they are paying for their fire department now, as compared with before, I do not know, but as a result of it so far they have received no change in rates or of classification; but I think there is a greater chance of a change now than there was before.

LANTERMAN: For a higher or a lower rate?

COLTON: For a poorer classification, but that is dependent upon the city's plan and the city's plan has been good.

LANTERMAN: Are there any other questions by the committee? If not, thank you very much for your patience. I think you have been very helpful to us.

COLTON: I am glad to hear that.

LANTERMAN: Thank you, Mr. Colton.

- Recess of 10 Minutes -

LANTERMAN: Is Ralph Eliaser here, the research man in the field of fire investigation? Mr. Eliaser and Mr. Smith, do you want to come up and answer some of the questions for us as to the presentation made by Mayor Peavey this morning in relation to the change at Downey? Would you see fit to make your comparisons as to the statements that were made?

Mr. Eliaser, will you identify yourself - who you are and why.

RALPH ELIASER, Daniel W. Johnson and Associates:
I am Ralph Eliaser. I am associated with the firm of Daniel W. Johnson and Associates.

LANTERMAN: Who are they?

ELIASER: The first part of this statement is somewhat of an elaboration of that; I'm going to identify myself and that firm. I think it is important for you people on the subcommittee to have that identification in view of some of the facts and statements I intend to make before the committee.

LANTERMAN: All right.

ELIASER: Mr. Chairman, members of the Subcommittee, the staff, and Mr. Bradley, I am associated with the firm of Daniel W. Johnson and Associates. One of the functions of this private organization is to render economic counsel to employee organizations, including the performance of professional research and statistical work for use in the field of industrial relation legislation, and other fields. It was in this capacity that I was requested in August of 1956, by the Federated Fire Fighters of California, to render professional assistance to them in their anticipated study relative to the feasibility of functional consolidation of the fire protection services within the County of Los Angeles. The Federated Fire Fighters felt a particular need to have

professional assistance in developing a proper and orderly means of presenting the cost and budgetary data they intended to obtain concerning the cost of fire protection within Los Angeles County in the forty incorporated cities which have paid fire department personnel and in the Consolidated Fire Protection District of Los Angeles County.

They were aware of the fact that numerous problems would arise relative to presenting the data in a professional, accurate and understandable manner, and that the use of certain recognized statistical techniques for computing estimates would be necessary. Our firm conscientiously undertook the professional task of filling these needs of the Fire Fighters in conducting this portion of their Study and the results are set forth in Section B of Chapter 2 relative to Present Cost of Fire Protection in Los Angeles County. That section runs from page 19 to page 50 of the Special Report on Fire Services in Los Angeles County, as published by the Assembly of the State of California, which you have before you. We believe we have succeeded in presenting as accurate a picture as possible and that if there are any errors on estimates, we believe they are on the conservative side.

Right here I believe it is appropriate to emphasize to you members of this important subcommittee that in my work with the Federated Fire Fighters of California on this project, I found the members to be motivated by an honest and sincere desire to conduct their study in a factual and impartial manner.

I have the utmost respect for the honesty and integrity of the men who I had the pleasure of working with on this project. The driving motivation for the many long hours of hard work put in by these men was to bend every effort to find the best solution to the problem of how to render the most efficient, highest quality of fire protection services in Los Angeles County to the citizens of the county at the most reasonable possible cost to the tax paying citizens of the county. I can say to you today without any equivocation that I know this is their main concern as they appear before you at these hearings today and tomorrow.

They are concerned with the citizens of this great metropolitan area of ours and how to best protect their lives and property at the most reasonable cost. They are as delighted as I am in the knowledge that this Subcommittee on Functional Consolidation is composed of gentlemen who are just as concerned about the same thing, namely, the public interest.

I must say at this time that in my opinion, for whatever it may be worth, the findings of this study conducted by the Federated Fire Fighters of California indicate a definite need for some form of functional consolidation of the fire services within the County of Los Angeles. There are many compelling and indisputable facts contained in this study which indicate that this is a solution if the public interest is to be our paramount consideration. Some thinking as to the

precise form this functional consolidation should take has been given by Captain Smith of the Federated Fire Fighters of California earlier today.

I am not going to take up the valuable time of you gentlemen on the subcommittee to discuss in detail the procedures, methods and estimating techniques used to present Section B of Chapter 2 relative to the present cost of fire protection in Los Angeles County or to discuss the findings contained in that section. All of this is set forth in that section in considerable detail and I am referring you again to pages 19 through 50 of the study. We have endeavored to present this section in a manner that can be readily understood. However, this was not easy because we were dealing with a complex subject in many respects, so I will be glad to try to answer any questions you may want to direct to me relative to this section at the conclusion of my prepared statement.

As you may have discovered, the methods, procedures and basis for the estimates which appear later in the section are specifically explained on pages 21 through 28 of the study.

I might just add here that what we endeavored to do wherever a figure was not readily available out of either a fire department budget or another section of the city's budget that was attributable to a fire protection cause, was to compute a figure or get an estimate, in which case we have explained the basis for that estimate, and how it was done.

The purpose of the survey itself, as conducted by the 25 man committee from the Federated Fire Fighters - and it

explains in this study how the committee went about getting the information - was to get at the facts relative to the cost of providing fire fighting services, including the correlation or relationship between the size of the city and its fire department, its operating costs and the quality of service provided. Obviously this would provide some valuable clues to the advantages and disadvantages of functional consolidation.

There are two paragraphs on page 22 of the study which I believe warrant emphasis in this connection. Let me quote them verbatim for you:

"We are obviously interested for purposes of this analysis in what it actually costs to operate the various fire departments. We believe that it is safe to assume that the taxpaying citizen cares little as to whether or not such costs are actually reflected in the fire department budget or in other budgets or funds such as water department budget, capital outlay funds, general funds, etc. The citizen pays the bill in either event as reflected in the total tax rate.

"The fact is that fire department budgets only partially reflect the true cost of operating a fire department, because costs of operating the department do appear in other funds or budgets. The extent to which the fire department budget reflects the total cost varies by city and county according to the different accounting procedures adopted in each case. Nowhere in this section is any criticism intended relative to said varying accounting procedures. Our only purpose is to ascertain as closely as possible the facts as to the true and total actual costs of operating these various fire departments, regardless of where such costs are budgeted. As will be shown presently, there is usually a substantial difference between the stated fire department budgets and what it actually costs in total to operate these fire departments."

Captain Smith has summarized some of the findings relative to the differences between the budget cost in the fire department budget and the actual total cost in his earlier presentation here today.

I might add here that one of the significant things that some of you people on the subcommittee picked up in Mr. Peavey's presentation, when he was making comparisons, and we will probably come back to this later in the questions, when he was making comparisons with Huntington Park, Southgate, and Vernon fire department costs, he did not make it clear whether he was talking about what the fire department budget said it cost to run one of those departments or what the total actual costs were in running those departments, if you take everything into consideration that is properly attributable to fire fighting operations.

I think that possibly the best way and the fastest way to illustrate this point is by means of showing you a chart which we have prepared which takes an imaginary City A and a City B and it shows, based on differences in accounting procedures and budget practice, how in one case fire department costs are actually reflected in a fire department fund, or budget, and how in the other case where the same amount of money for fire protection purposes is actually spent, these costs are reflected in several other funds besides the fire department fund. To simplify the chart for illustration purposes, we have only included a few of the items of cost necessary to run a fire department. In other words, actually, if this was a complete picture, you would have a lot of additional items included in the chart.

Looking at the chart you will note that the fire department fund for City B shows a total budget of \$471,800

and no other cost factors are found in any other fund. We have looked through the entire city published budget, for example, through every fund to find if there is anything else attributable to the fire department. In this hypothetical case of City B, it would be like a consolidated fire district; the cost would be fully reflected in the fire department budget of \$471,800. So, presumably the total actual cost of operating the fire department in City B is \$471,800. Now in City A, I will tell you a secret ahead of time since you already know it, and that is that the total of the costs reflected in the five different funds shown is the same \$471,800. However, you will note that only \$289,000 of that is reflected in the actual fire department fund. The cost of the cities' contribution to the retirement fund for firemen is \$30,000, and that figure appears in the retirement fund budget - not the fire department budget.

Now I might say here, that even though this is a hypothetical case, as you may realize, it is based on many of the things that the men actually found in the survey; for example, specifically, on retirement there is one separate fund in many of the cities for overall retirement purposes, and what the committee had to do was find out what proportion of that contribution was for the personnel in the fire department. It may be difficult to believe, but in some cases the city had not actually ever thought about this, or had a readily available computation of how much of that was for the fire

department personnel. That is where we had to estimate what the average contribution by cities for fire department retirement actually is, based on the State Retirement System. Similarly, you will find various other items of cost incurred by the fire department in City A contained in other budgets - not in the fire department budget, such as capital outlay expenditures for fire stations - that's the second one up there, that \$100,000 figure - and new fire hydrants, Workmen's Compensation Insurance for firemen, (in most cases this was an overall insurance fund for all city personnel, not broken down by departments) hydrant installation - you find that in the Water Department fund - and you can go over those items and you will notice the various items that typically might be found in the city budget, other than the fire department budget. You will also note that while you have some capital outlay budgeted in City A in the fire department fund, the smaller items of capital outlay, the larger items were in a separate capital outlay fund. Now again, while we have a hypothetical case for illustration purposes, this is also not uncommon to find some forms of capital outlay in the fire department budget, and other forms, particularly the larger items, buying new fire apparatus, constructing fire stations, in a capital outlay fund - or bonded indebtedness may be incurred for those expenditures.

The actual point that needs emphasis here is that if we were to assume that this chart contains all of the various cost items necessary to operate a fire department, in comparing

the cost of operating a fire department in the two cities, the significant figure in City A is the total of the five figures in the five different funds or budgets. The total fire department budget figure of \$289,000 in City A only reflects about 60% of the cost of actually operating that fire department, not 100%. It is the 100% budgeted cost figure that we are interested in, and we assume you are interested in, for purposes of this kind of analysis; and the actual intent was to get the total cost in each of the cities. Unfortunately we were not able to actually do it; sometimes we couldn't even make an estimate, let alone get a breakdown. To that extent, you will notice in the study that there are just blank figures there so that in some of the cities it is true. As much as the committee tried, we actually ended up probably reflecting, in some of the cities, only 95 or 96 percent of the total cost of operating their fire departments.

Now when you go through, if you have not already done so, the findings contained in Section B of Chapter 2 of the study, and when you endeavor to interpret these findings, I think you will discover that for many reasons it is a fact that at the present time the larger fire departments as a rule are giving more effective and more efficient fire protection to its citizens at approximately the same proportionate cost as the smaller departments. This seemed to occur when the actual cost of fire protection and the Board of Fire Underwriters grade for each fire department is compared between

cities within Los Angeles County. The Board of Fire Underwriters grade is still the best known indication of a fire department's efficiency and effectiveness. This indicates that under a proper form of functional consolidation of the various fire protection services within this county, a more efficient service would result for the benefit of the tax-paying citizens of this county and that this could be accomplished at no extra cost to those citizens; in fact, savings probably would result from lower administrative costs, advantages of centralized mass purchasing and a possible reduction in fire insurance premiums.

Now to some extent, some of these factors have been explored by the subcommittee through the witnesses already heard today.

There is just one more subject that I would like to comment on and that is with respect to the impact of continual annexations by the cities and the impact of the growing trend toward incorporations on fire protection within Los Angeles County. The number of incorporations that have taken place in this county during just the past three years is phenomenal. It looks like it is going to continue at an even more rapid pace. Some of the recent incorporations have created a serious problem insofar as the Los Angeles County Consolidated Fire Protection District is concerned; but more important than that, the newly incorporated city which establishes its own fire department is merely complicating an already difficult problem.

When an incorporation has been completed and the newly incorporated city decides to cancel County Consolidated Fire Protection services and set up its own fire department, serious problems result. No notice is required to cancel this county service. The budget of the consolidated district is seriously affected when these cancellations occur during the budget year. Efficient budget planning is hindered because of this problem.

A situation could exist where the Consolidated Fire Protection District establishes its budget for the coming fiscal year and in a sincere desire to provide the best possible fire protection for the citizens of a particular area, purchases new equipment and builds new fire stations costing hundreds of thousands of dollars. In the middle of the budget year the area may incorporate and without advance notice cancel the services of the Consolidated Fire Protection District. The inefficiencies and waste resulting from this and the unpredictable aspects of this situation should pinpoint the need for and the advisability of functional consolidation. The effect of the chaotic condition I have just described on budget planning and on providing effective fire protection services as such should be obvious.

As a final word, I would like to say that the very factors which have been set forth in the special report should be realistically and objectively evaluated by the citizens of Los Angeles County, as well as by this subcommittee, in its

determination of possible needed legislation. Previous to assisting in the preparation of the budget material in the study which I referred to, I had little personal knowledge of fire department operations or fire protection problems, as such. I can honestly say that I received a liberal education on the subject by assisting in this study, and I am firmly convinced that a metropolitan fire authority, embodying a new structure, must be established throughout the county as the only practical solution to the ever increasing problems we are faced with today in the field of fire protection in the metropolitan areas. This structural change would be in the interest of - and would result in - substantial benefit to the citizens of Los Angeles County.

That concludes, Mr. Chairman, the more or less prepared remarks that I had available, and I would be glad to answer any questions that you may have.

LANTERMAN: I would like to ask this question, Mr. Eliaser. On your reference to fire hydrants, fire station land, hoses and fire alarms, that was under capital outlay, did you take that as a total expenditure for the year or did you amortize it over the period and life of the equipment?

ELIASER: You will notice in the study itself there is a breakdown which tries to take into account this factor, and what we did was this. If a city was encountering normal capital outlay expenditures - for example, in a growing city it might be normal to assume that they were going to construct

one fire station, or one new piece of fire equipment - if that city had a policy to budget that as an outlay, regardless of what budget it was put into, an outlay to be met during the next fiscal year, we just recorded it that way. If they voted a bond to take care of that, what we did was to compute the actual cost of paying off principal and interest for the coming fiscal year. All of our figures were reduced to one fiscal year. Now if - and this is part of the answer to your question - we could see that, for example, if my memory is correct, the city of Compton was encountering unusually heavy capital outlay expenditures in the fiscal year we were talking about, such as building a whole fire department headquarters building, which they might not have to do for another 50, or we don't know how many years, we put in a factor later to try and amortize the effect of that kind of thing. We took cities, where above a certain amount of their total budget expenditures if it was for capital outlay, we gave, for whatever it may be worth, a factor that would show how the cost would be reduced if you did amortize that over a twenty year period; but we only did that with cities which are listed in the report. In those cases I believe there were approximately ten out of forty where we could see that they were encountering unusually heavy capital outlay expenditures, and it wouldn't be fair to assume that those same expenditures would repeat year after year.

LANTERMAN: Any questions by committee?

JOHNSON: I would like to ask this, did you consider at all, under this consolidation move, the number of more men

and the amount of equipment and the number of houses that would be required under consolidation, if there would be any?

ELIASER: Let me say as part of an answer to that question, those findings were not set forth in this section that I am discussing, so I will go on my memory on that. I think in the study you will find a separate section showing - I'm not sure if it was reduced to an amount - the number of fire stations that the Federated Fire Fighters thought could be eliminated under a consolidation by virtue of the location of those stations. Now the extent to which that was reduced and the cost saving, I think there was a figure in there. Some of these other items you are asking about in the other portions of the study are mentioned as factors, but they are not all reduced to cost. In some cases it would be pretty difficult to predict the actual amount of savings by consolidation. One thing I would like to say in that connection is - I think we all tend to lose sight of this - but the savings, for example, on the existing fire stations and equipment is only part of the story. I think we are all projecting in our thinking where are we going to be ten years from now. If there was only a happy way we could predict what we would save in the next ten years from anticipated further overlapping and duplicating, then you would have a meaningful figure. I wish this could be done. I would like to make this point, that if you stop the overlapping and duplication now, that would be one figure. This is difficult enough to compute on all lines, but when you

project it, the trend continues as the population increases. Since we are really one metropolitan area, we have to think in terms of what we are going to be paying in the future to get the true picture. Admittedly, this would have to be based on estimates. You would have to take your estimate on population increase and various other factors. It could be done with reasonable accuracy, but it would be difficult; anything that is in the future is an estimate.

JOHNSON: As I understand it, the Underwriters say that right now we are all - whether county or city - far in the rear from the standpoint of the number of fire stations required.

Now, let me ask Captain Smith, did you counsel with the Underwriters as to elimination of these stations, or are you talking about a station like - well, let's take for example, one of the stations closest to Beverly Hills, for the sake of discussion. If that was inside the radius of the Underwriters' requirement - you are talking about the elimination of that one and moving it to some other location - it seems to me that is the one we are having the trouble with from the standpoint of the fire service.

SMITH: Mr. Johnson, I am going to answer it in this way. First, in determining the number of stations in the overlapping station jurisdiction, we compiled a map, including the station location of each installation throughout the entire county, and then by use of the Board of Underwriters minimum requirements

and its application to these stations, we were able to determine where these overlapping areas existed, but it was done under the minimum requirements of the Board of Underwriters.

JOHNSON: Thank you, Captain.

ELIASER: I would like to read one sentence on page 69 of the Fire Fighters' report, and then you can refer to it in the maps that follow: "Therefore, elimination of these 11 stations should result in an annual savings of \$1,320,000. With more detailed study, this estimated savings figure could very well climb to three or four millions, resulting from the elimination of additional stations." In other words, based on those maps, they made a conservative estimate, and at least 11 stations could be eliminated at an annual savings of over a million dollars. Again I raise the question of - particularly if the trend toward incorporation continues - if we look at this ten years from now and nothing was done between now and ten years, where would we be; I mean, how many more stations would we have to eliminate for efficient service, how much more overlapping would there be, and so on?

LANTERMAN: Have you any comment now as to statements that were made this morning relating to the Downey situation that seem to be in conflict with the presentation of your report?

SMITH: I think I can say it in this manner, Mr. Lanterman. In Mr. Peavey's presentation to the committee it was mentioned that the City of Downey now has three stations,

six pieces of equipment, and 54 men, upon which they apparently intend to ride on the Board of Underwriters rating. Mr. Peavey overlooked to mention that, as Mr. Colton pointed out to you, the present city of Downey at the time that grading was allowed was graded on the basis of a battalion level with, I forget now, some 172 men involved in the response coverage of that particular city. How close it can come remains to be seen in the next survey of that city, as to whether their cost factors are going to be lower or above that of the Consolidated Fire Protection District. If they have to come anywhere near the amount of men, stations, and equipment, that were used in the previous report, very likely their budget is going to be as high, or higher, than it was in the county before.

LANTERMAN: Well, the question that I am concerned with is have they made a substantial saving, at a potential rating increase?

SMITH: There again I would have to answer that in the same manner that Mr. Colton answered it; until the survey is made and the determination as to what classification there will be that we will be buying insurance under, we can't determine - the cost of the fire department can probably be determined quite easily - but until we know the exact increase in insurance rates, we can't come up with a real answer for you on that one.

LANTERMAN: Well, the \$600,000 versus \$400,000 - the County \$600,000 and the cities \$400,000 - actually then has no relative value as a comparison for the purpose of the record that he made this morning that they are saving \$200,000

by virtue of having withdrawn from the Consolidated Fire District.

SMITH: On the surface it might appear so, but I would suggest that we wait until the survey is completed. I think there will be a different analysis of the outcome. They may have saved \$200,000 and they may not have.

LANTERMAN: What is the situation in Norwalk at this time? Has the city of Norwalk made any determination as to the creation of their own fire department, or are they staying with the Consolidated Fire Department?

SMITH: To my knowledge, they are staying. I understand they have studied the program, but there has been no move made by the city of Norwalk as yet.

LANTERMAN: Are there any questions by members of the committee?

HOLMES: Yes, I would like to ask one. Mr. Peavey made the statement this morning that there were only three fire departments, or something like that, that were available, and that they were about eight miles away. How many county stations were available?

SMITH: If I remember correctly, Mr. Holmes, I believe nine stations were used in the compilation of the insurance grading when the city was served by the County. As far as distance is concerned, they range possibly from, well, two stations were within the city and station 25 was adjacent to it at the time, and those three engine companies were right

within the city or on the border. Then next to it, the engine companies were possibly, from the outer city limit to the boundary line, a mile and a half or two miles. As they branched out into the battalion area in the outer fringe areas, they were further apart.

HOLMES: Did those three stations constitute more equipment than what they have at the present time?

SMITH: No. Well, let's see, they had two engines in the headquarters station and they had one engine in the Rancho Hospital and one engine at Station 25. That gave them four operating engines within the city.

HOLMES: But there were other engines available in the close proximity? That's the thing I wanted to bring out.

SMITH: Yes.

HOLMES: Thank you.

JOHNSON: Just one question from Fred. Didn't you consider those nine companies under a battalion? Wasn't that considered the battalion strength - the nine companies?

SMITH: It was pretty close to that.

BRADLEY: Would one of you gentlemen explain to the committee for the record just what your 63 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation covers?

SMITH: Do you want a breakdown analysis of the budget as to where each penny goes?

BRADLEY: No, just roughly, what items does it cover?

SMITH: The 63 cent tax rate covers all items that are a cost of fire protection - salaries and wages, capital outlay,

maintenance and operation, hydrant rentals, amortization payments on stations, amortization payments on property and apparatus, includes the full payment of retirement to the County Retirement System

LANTERMAN: And administrative costs?

SMITH: Includes administrative costs. I might note on the administrative cost, the County Fire Department, as such, is administered by a single administrative division which administers the six fire protection districts and the Forester and Fire Warden Division.

LANTERMAN: And that is apportioned?

SMITH: It is all apportioned, yes. All costs, Mr. Bradley, of the fire protection of Los Angeles County is included in that 63 cents.

ELIASER: May I elaborate for a minute on one point there? As a result of this investigation by the committee, to begin with, there is no bonded indebtedness, as such, in the Consolidated Fire Protection District, so there is no other factor there. As near as we could find out, every item attributable to fire department cost was reflected in that budget - even all administrative costs being pro-rated, not just the fire chiefs - and very frankly, in all of the other cities we didn't even try to get a prorate of administrative costs, other than fire chiefs' salaries. It would have been impossible, as I think you can understand, in all areas. The only item where we had to make any adjustments in the 1956-57

budget - and it came out to less than half a cent - was this, and I'm reading from the footnote on the bottom of page 35, because to our knowledge this was the only item that was not reflected, and I quote: "There are 826 hydrants on which the county pays no rental or water usage charges. As per footnote 4, costs have been computed for these hydrants on the basis of \$20.40 per year. 826 times \$20.40 equals \$16,850." So, we added \$16,850 for that purpose, which was the same method we used in the other cities. That figure is, as I think you realize, practically nothing in a budget the size of Consolidated; but in other words, where the utility in a particular area had a policy of not having a rental charge, or just a token charge, we did apply that adjustment, and that's the only thing that even indirectly we could find that would not be fully reflected in their budget.

LANTERMAN: I spoke to Chief Carroll of Santa Monica. He did not stay to make a presentation, but he said Chief Miller would make the presentation for the fire chiefs. He indicated, however, that in Santa Monica they did not reflect, as I understood it, any of these costs as a breakdown in the fire department budget. All chargeable items are not reflected; they are kept in the body of the budget, and it is considered, I presume, as a matter of procedure that the corporation of the city does not need to isolate or segregate these items as a cost accounting factor, other than the actual salaries and perhaps some others.

ELIASER: I might say this. You were talking about the City of Santa Monica, and the figures on page 34 show . . . well, I think its significant when Chief Carroll makes such a comment to you because Santa Monica, of the 40 cities, came one of the closest to fully reflecting the fire department charges. In other words, there were only about four or five items that were not reflected, which is better than most in terms of an accounting procedure. His is not an extreme example, and I meant to mention this earlier. It isn't understood by everybody that, for example, in some of the cities like Covina and West Covina, which have just come to mind, it is normal and natural that on telephone charges and utility charges, they do not worry, or segregate, or prorate, their total telephone bill or their utility charge. It all just comes out of the city budget and is budgeted that way. When some of our 25 man committee went to cities like that and asked the question, it was like they were hearing it for the first time. They had never thought of it. This is not a budget problem to them. It's only a budget problem to your committee and to us who are interested in this problem of trying to really get the facts as to what is totally attributable to fire protection costs; but I think we should emphasize it. No one would expect any of these cities to change, particularly the small cities, those accounting procedures just for the convenience of getting at these facts, but it would be nice to have them.

LANTERMAN: The only interest that we have in trying to get that segregated item cost, the allocation down to the mill

for this factor of cost accounting, is to make a fair and equitable comparison between the cost accounted 62 or 63 cents of the County Consolidated, which is, according to all the statements that have been made, that kind of a compilation of figures. Every possible related apportion charge that could possibly be hung on to this factor has been allocated by the county in its accounting system. Therefore, in asking the cities what their comparable cost was, in all fairness, as to why they could do this for 32 cents instead of 63, they were not speaking in the same terms. That was the only reason why we have gone into this aspect.

ELIASER: That's correct. The problem is that sometimes it was honestly impossible for the cities to give us the information. They just didn't have it.

LANTERMAN: Their accounting system did not take that factor into consideration.

SMITH: Mr. Lanterman, there is an interesting item I have that I think would be good to get into the record. It was stated today that Downey ran its fire department for \$400,000 a year. They employed 55 firemen of all ranks up to the chief engineer, which, based at \$7,000 a year - which is an extremely conservative figure - runs to a \$385,000 salary item in a 55 man fire department with four engine companies.

LANTERMAN: Well, now you're assuming that they pay that amount.

SMITH: I would say the \$7,000 a year is a very extremely conservative figure. That includes vacation time,

sick time vacation, all employee expenses included, but that's not the take home salary. That is a very conservative figure based on the amount of money each employee of the fire department costs the city. I just wanted to point out that at \$7,000 a year, there would be a \$385,000 a year salary item.

LANTERMAN: Well, of course we asked the Mayor for a copy of the budget and when we get it, we'll check that.

SMITH: Thank you, sir.

ELIASER: One thing that I don't know and about which there was some discussion in the audience, and which I think the subcommittee should look for when it gets those facts on Downey, is whether the \$400,000 is projected to a full 12 month fiscal year or not. Some people think that since the Downey Fire Department only started on its own some time in September, that \$400,000 figure may be a 9 or 10 month cost for the remainder of what was left of the fiscal year. We just don't know. That would account for some of this, and the other thing is I've never seen the current budget they are working on, and again, you would have to look to see to what extent these items are in the fire department budget, and to what extent they are somewhere else.

LANTERMAN: That we will take a look at, but the main factor is that Downey is not a guinea pig for purposes of anything except by comparison, on the basis of whether or not in our report we have valid figures relating to consolidated fire districts.

SMITH: Yes, sir.

LANTERMAN: All right, thank you gentlemen. Mr. Keller, do you wish to make an observation or two?

LEWIS KELLER, Associate Counsel, League of California Cities: Mr. Chairman and members of the subcommittee, my name is Lewis Keller, representing the League of California Cities. As many of you realize, our Association, like the Federated Fire Fighters, is very much interested in finding ways that the taxpayer can obtain better city services, better local governmental services, at a lower cost. To that extent, we take the position that permissive, functional consolidation should be made possible where it is possible through such legislation to effect economies in providing local governmental services. We have read the special report issued by the committee in 1957 and have today heard the up-dating of it as presented by Captain Smith.

Reviewing the entire fire fighting situation in Los Angeles County at the present time, we have a few concerns. First, we are wondering whether or not the one year limitation on withdrawal, following incorporation, as practiced in the case of Downey, is completely a permissive thing. In other words, a newly incorporated city council is in the process of setting up a city government. Within one year it has to decide whether or not to set up its own fire department and cast the mold of the entire city, and, perhaps, as the report points out, effect fire service in the entire county. At the time the legislation went through, our organization did not oppose it, feeling that in most cases the county would - if a city thought

that it wanted seriously to consider withdrawing and setting up its own fire department - permit the city to give the notice within the year and then contract on a temporary basis until the city could definitely make up its mind which way it wanted to go.

Mayor Peavey said this morning for the record, as I recall, that in the case of Downey they were not permitted to continue the benefit of the County consolidated fire services for even a short period after the one year date had lapsed. Now, listening to that this morning just sounded a little bit like the pressure was being put on to effect consolidation, and if that continues, it could even happen that that would prevent a lot of consolidations. It would force cities to jump too fast away from consolidation. So we think perhaps that should be considered further.

Finally, the report, as stated to you by Chief Miller, does not seem to be completely inclusive as to the cost savings, which as a matter of fact, will follow from a countywide consolidation of fire services in Los Angeles County. We share those doubts, but we do not take any firm position at the present time. For example, the report indicates that under such a consolidation, it would inevitably follow that all salaries and retirement costs would be brought up to the highest; it would seem that costs would go up.

So far as the comparison on budgets is concerned, on page 37, for example, and this is just an example to show

that there is some possibility of factual statements in the special report being slightly erroneous in part, Hawthorne is stated to have a 73 cent rate for fire. A city manager, sitting next to me this morning, who was city manager of Hawthorne at that time and is now city manager for Santa Fe Springs, said that that reflected two trucks and one fire station - two major capital outlay items of equipment and one station - which were paid for out of that 73 cent rate. So, it is possible that some of those facts will bear a little closer analysis.

Then, on the assumption that it is efficient to have a metropolitan fire protection service, we feel that the forms of solution to the method of providing this metropolitan consolidated fire service, are not adequately enough considered in the special report. There are other alternatives, such as partial metropolitan consolidated districts in size, the possibilities of districts by which cities could serve unincorporated areas on a contract basis, all of which would result in possibly smaller units of government if they should turn out to be the cheapest on the theory that the biggest ones reach the point of diminishing returns. In other words, the range of alternative solutions, we believe, should be explored a little more thoroughly.

Finally, we believe that the committee should consider a little more thoroughly the matter of home rule - of people's rights to close representation; in other words, the smaller unit of government on a representative basis.

All of this is by way of asking the committee to permit us to submit a report along the lines of the special report submitted by the Federated Fire Fighters, at a date prior to the 1959 session, which will parallel that report and develop what we think will be our views of what the functional consolidation of fire services might be in Los Angeles County, and we will likewise pledge that our report will be equally impartial and equally objective to that submitted by the Federated Fire Fighters.

LANTERMAN: We would welcome such a report, Mr. Keller, and we are grateful to the League for its proffered suggestion.

I would also like to make an observation at this time that in our hearing in Sacramento, relating to the submission of the metropolitan report there to the committee last December, I believe that some sort of suggestion was made by myself, which was purely voluntary and personal, that some sort of an armistice might be declared while they were not yet ready to adopt a metropolitan report. It might be that it would be destructive not to proceed with their metropolitan consideration, but it would also be best to have an armistice on annexations or incorporations pending, so as not to clutter up the metropolitan structure. Now all we are referring to here is a possibility that we ought to stabilize that which is already consolidated - not to make it mandatory that they shall not have their own districts - but the fact is there is a commission being set up

here locally in Los Angeles County for the purpose of a metropolitan study; and if that metropolitan study is to have any basis of fact at all, we ought to at least keep intact to a degree these things that we already have of a metropolitan type service, without chopping it up. I presume that the indication of the one year withdrawal was a restrainer for purposes such as that to sort of stabilize things without having the things that are already big being made smaller, so that then we can re-examine them to make them bigger again if necessary. Actually, this is just a matter of an interim kind of problem, don't you think, and all of this material we have been able to get today has certainly been beneficial to the committee, as far as material is concerned; but it has also, I think, been very beneficial to everybody concerned to have all of these aspects and facets on both sides of the thing brought to our attention. I personally received a lot more information than I thought I was going to get because I thought I knew considerable about this subject, but I personally am very happy that we did have as extensive a hearing as we did today on this material. Your report can be very helpful, I am sure, to keep a balanced viewpoint on this matter.

Does anyone in the committee now have anything to say - any questions? We will go into the matter of contract services tomorrow, and the problems connected with that.

We will now adjourn until 10 o'clock tomorrow morning.